DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 328 790 CE 057 013

AUTHOR	Murphy, Lila C.; Vetter, Louise B.
TITLE	Federal Legislation To Eliminate Sex Discrimination in Vocational Education: "The Impossible Acts," 1976 and 1984.
INSTITUTION	Delaware Univ., Newark.
SPONS AGENCY	Delaware State Dept. of Public Instruction, Dover. Div. of Vocational Education.
PUB DATE	Aug 90
NOTE	306p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Sex Equity Coordinator, Department of Public Instruction, Townsend Bldg., P.O. Box 1402, Dover, DE 19903 ($25.00).
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses (070)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC13 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Affirmative Action; Civil Rights; Equal Education; *Federal Legislation; Feminism; Nondiscriminatory Education; Postsecondary Education; Secondary Education; *Sex Discrimination; *Sex Fairness; State Agencies; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Carl D Perkins Vocational Education Act 1984

ABSTRACT

This project is a detailed history of two pieces of legislation that sought to eliminate sex discrimination in vocational education: the Vocational Education Amendments of 1976 and the Carl D. Perkins Act of 1984. The report explains why they happened and the results as seen by those most involved. It looks at the key individuals and groups that made a difference; what really happened during the legislative process; and how agencies, programs, and students were affected by the changes mandated under the new laws. The study collected qualitative information from those who created federal legislation, subsequent reports and studies on that legislation, and the National Assessment of Vocational Education. The study covers the 10-year period from 1977 to 1987. Information for the study was obtained by conducting personal interviews, making contacts, and reviewing legislation and national survey data. The following five chapters are included in this report: (1) the legislation--hearings and testimony; (2) the views of major contributors to the legislative process; (3) implementing the legislation; (4) major contributors to the legislation; and (5) observations and recommendations. The bibliography contains 153 entries. Nineteen appendices include a chronology, lists of sex equity personnel and study participants, study questionnaires, equity publications by state, excerpts from the laws, data on female enrollment and employment, and excerpts from equity reports and studies. (NLA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED328790

Federal Legislation to Eliminate Sex Discrimination in Vocational Education

"The Impossible Acts"

1976 and 1984

CE057013

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L Murphy

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FEDERAL LEGISLATION TO ELIMINATE SEX DISCRIMINATION IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION: "THE IMPOSSIBLE ACTS", 1976 AND 1984

Lila C. Murphy

with

Louise B. Vetter
as Consultant

The University of Delaware
Alison Hall Annex
Newark, Delaware 19716

August, 1990

This research project was partially funded
by a grant from the Delaware Department of Public Instruction,
Division of Vocational Education under the
Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984

The University of Delaware is an equal opportunity employer
and does not discriminate or deny services on the basis of
race, color, national origin, sex, handicap, and/or age.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

As with any study or project of this magnitude, many people were involved and their assistance and support is greatly appreciated. Gratitude is extended to the Division of Vocational Education, Delaware State Department of Public Instruction for supporting this study with funds available under the Carl D. Perkins Act of 1984.

Special thanks are extended to those individuals and groups who were major contributors to the development, passage and implementation of the sex equity provisions in the Vocational Amendments of 1976, and the Carl D. Perkins Act of 1984. This includes Washington, DC based women's groups, vocational education and other educational state and national organizations, members of Congress and their aides and governmental leaders. These busy people gave of their valuable time -- freely and enthusiastically. This project would not have been possible without their open and candid discussion of the issues.

The women and girls in this country and anyone concerned with providing all persons with equal opportunities, owe a great debt to the National Coalition of Women and Girls in Education (NCWGE). Without the leadership of this group, it is doubtful that the sex equity provisions would have been included in the federal vocational education legislation. Janet Wells, who represented the Coalition throughout the years; United States Representative Shirley Chisholm from New York; and Carol O. Mayhew of Delaware are cited later for their unique contributions.

All sex equity coordinators, past and current, deserve our respect and gratitude for their dedication and service to eliminate sex discrimination in vocational education. It has been a difficult road for them and they have met the challenge with dedication and tenacity. They have made a difference! Appreciation is extended to the Vocational Education Equity Council for providing leadership at the national level and a support system for state sex equity coordinators throughout the past decade.

There are always those behind the scenes who do the detailed work associated with a project of this nature: to the editors, typists, printers, and my secretaries, thanks for your help and patience.

SPECIAL RECOGNITION

LOUISE B. VETTER

Special recognition and thanks are extended to Dr. Louise Vetter of L.B. Vetter, Inc., of Columbus, Ohio, who served as consultant to the project. Dr. Vetter is a pioneer and nationally recognized expert in the area of sex equity in vocational education. Some of her many contributions can be found in the Bibliography of this report. In addition to editing the report, Dr. Vetter prepared the material on the sex equity coordinators' responsibilities, the development of VEEC and the contributions of the National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio (NCRVE); all found in Chapter III. Also, she participated in many of the personal interviews, made contacts and developed the list of resources produced by the states and the Chronology of Events which can be found in the Appendix.

For over twenty years, Dr. Vetter served as the person on the National Center staff responsible for addressing sex equity issues. Her intimate knowledge of people, places and events was invaluable in developing and implementing this study.

DEDICATION

This document is dedicated to three important people; two for their unique contributions to the development and passage of the sex equity provisions in the legislation; and one for believing in the need for this study.

U.S. REPRESENTATIVE SHIRLEY CHISHOLM

Representative Shirley Chisholm from the State of New York opened the Pandora's Box that contained the truth about the serious issues facing women and their families in the mid-seventies. She chaired the House Subcommittee hearings on Sex Discrimination and Sex Stereotyping in Vocational Education. These hearings changed the attitudes and actions of Congress regarding women's issues. Since many of the problems presented at the hearings were financial/employment ones, vocational education was placed in the spotlight -- personal desire to improve the quality of life for women made her a champion for women's rights in a time when few were concerned. She had the foresight to recognize that education, not just training, was essential in improving individual and family life.

> It was really Shirley Chisholm's work which set the groundwork for the Vocational Education Amendments of 1976.
>
> Michael Brustein, Attorney

JANET WELLS

Known as "Ms. Vocational Education," Janet Wells was the person who took the leadership in representing the many women and girls in this nation who needed vocational education programs and services. She was not a vocational educator. She had a background in journalism and a deep personal and professional commitment to civil rights and equity for all people. Her understanding of the political process and her innate ability to stimulate others to listen to the issues facing women in a changing world, brought her respect from the decision-makers on the Washington scene. Her thoroughness and accuracy in preparing and presenting testimony before Congress was essential in the victories achieved by the Coalition -- passage of the "impossible" provisions of the Vocational Amendments of 1976, and the Carl D. Perkins Act of 1984.

CAROL O. MAYHEW

This study would not have been undertaken except for the persistence of Carol O. Mayhew, former Sex Equity Supervisor in Delaware. She encouraged the Vocational Education Equity Council to support the effort and worked to secure the funding needed to initiate the project. She was committed to providing a history of this landmark legislation and its impact.

> I was appointed to the sex equity position in Delaware on January 1, 1978. My tenure in the position has been challenging always interesting, and although, at times, frustrating, it has been very rewarding... The central issue has not changed in the nine years that I have been in the job. At the core of the problem is the poor self image women have of themselves and of their ability to cope with life as independent persons. Vocational equity programs have attempted to provide girls and women with choices and with the support systems necessary for them to exercise these new options. The choice may be a traditional job rather than a non-traditional job, but if the end result in personal and financial independence as well as the potential for upward mobility in the job market, the sex equity program has been successful. Both individuals and systems must continue to grow and change if equal opportunity is to become a reality for all girls and women. We have come a long way and I am very happy to have played a small part in the effort.

Carol O. Mayhew
State Supervisor of Sex Equity,
Delaware
1978-1988

PREFACE

Fourteen years have passed since Congress passed the Vocational Education Amendments of 1976. This legislation and the more recent law, The Carl D. Perkins Act of 1984, have had a profound effect on vocational education programs and services across the nation. The recognition that all individuals were not receiving equitable treatment in vocational education was, in itself, a significant step toward improving opportunities for women in the work place.

To change the attitudes of the nation's leadership about sex equity and to chart a new direction in vocational education was not an easy task. Many women's groups and national organizations representing the views of a diverse population, championed the cause. Congress passed landmark legislation designed to eliminate sex bias and discrimination in many aspects of our society. Yet, it is always the efforts of key individuals that make the difference. Who were these individuals and groups? What really happened during the legislative process? How were agencies, programs and students affected by the changes mandated under the new laws? These are questions that are seldom asked and answered, and are the most important to record.

Governmental agencies have archives where copies of federal legislation and subsequent reports and studies on that legislation are deposited. The recent National Assessment of Vocational Education (NAVE) produced five volumes which include statistical information relating to all aspects of vocational education. However, the qualitative information which can only be gathered from those who participated has not been collected or documented. This study was designed to remedy that situation.

The study began in 1987, at the request of the Vocational Education Equity Council (VEEC) and was designed to cover the ten year period from 1977, when the Vocational Amendments of 1976 were implemented, through the reauthorization and passage of the Carl D. Perkins Act in 1984, to the year 1987, the tenth anniversary of the establishment of the Vocational Education Equity Council.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS i

SPECIAL RECOGNITION ii
DEDICATION iii

PREFACE v

ACRONYMS USED IN REPORT viii

INTRODUCTION x

CHAPTER I: THE LEGISLATION: HEARINGS AND TESTIMONY 1

CHAPTER II: THE VIEWS OF MAJOR CONTRIBUTORS TO THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS 28

Part A: Questions and Discussions by Respondents 29
Part B: Personal Views and Observations by Respondents . . 53

CHAPTER III: IMPLEMENTING THE LEGISLATION 84

Sex Equity Coordinators: Roles and Responsibilities 84
Vocational Education Equity Council (VEEC) 88
Ten Years in Retrospect 91
National Survey of Current and Former State Sex Equity Coordinators 93
Contributions by the National Center for Research in Vocational Education - The Ohio State University . . . 108
Issues Needing Continued Attention 112

CHAPTER IV: MAJOR CONTRIBUTORS TO THE LEGISLATION 113

CHAPTER V: OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 140

BIBLIOGRAPHY 146

APPENDICES: 161
APPENDIX A: CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS 162
APPENDIX B: STATE PERSONNEL RESPONSIBLE FOR SEX EQUITY IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION (Through 1989) 172
APPENDIX C: SEX EQUITY COORDINATORS, CURRENT AND PAST, PARTICIPATING IN NATIONAL SURVEY 175
APPENDIX D: STUDY PARTICIPANTS 179
APPENDIX E: FEDERAL PERSONNEL 1973-1988 182

APPENDIX F: OBJECTIVES OF THE PROJECT 185
APPENDIX G: VOCATIONAL EDUCATION SEX EQUITY LEGISLATION STUDY: QUESTIONNAIRE PART I. 186
APPENDIX H: VOCATIONAL EDUCATION SEX EQUITY LEGISLATION STUDY: QUESTIONNAIRE PART II 192
APPENDIX I: RESOURCES PRODUCED BY STATE SEX EQUITY PROGRAMS . . 196

APPENDIX J: TITLE IX REGULATIONS. 212
APPENDIX K: VOCATIONAL AMENDMENTS OF 1976 - EXCERPTS FROM THE LAW 214
APPENDIX L: CARL D. PERKINS ACT OF 1984 - EXCERPTS FROM THE LAW 226

APPENDIX M: AVERAGE ENROLLMENT IN VOCATIONAL SUBJECTS BY SEX. . 231
APPENDIX N: DISTRIBUTION OF HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES ENTERING POSTSECONDARY VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN PUBLIC TWO-YEAR COLLEGES, TECHNICAL INSTITUTES AND PRIVATE VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS, CLASSES OF 1972 AND 1980. . . 235
APPENDIX O: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: REPORT BY NACVE AND NACWEP . . . 236
APPENDIX P: FACTS ON UNITED STATES WORKING WOMEN. 242

APPENDIX Q: POSITION PAPERS ON THE REAUTHORIZATION OF CARL D. PERKINS ACT OF 1984 BY: AAUW, WOW and VEEC. 245
APPENDIX R: SELECTED REPORTS AND STUDIES IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IMPACTING SEX EQUITY. 252
APPENDIX S: RECENT PAPERS AND PUBLICATIONS IMPACTING THE REAUTHORIZATION OF THE CARL D. PERKINS ACT OF 1984 280

ACRONYMS USED IN REPORT

SE: Sex Equity
SEC(s): Sex Equity Coordinator(s)
RFP: Request for Proposal
CWPS: Center for Women Policy Studies
NAVE: National Assessment of Vocational Education
OCR: Office for Civil Rights
SOICC: State Occupational Information Coordinating Committee
NOICC: National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee
WEAL: Women's Equity Action League
NOW: National Organization for Women
FFA: Future Farmers of America
FHA: Future Homemakers of America
AVTI: Area Vocational Technical Institute
PEER: Project on Equal Educational Rights
NAVE: National Assessment of Vocational Education
ERA: Equal Rights Amendment
WEEA: Women's Educational Equity Act
AVA: American Vocational Association
NACVE: National Advisory Council on Vocational Education
SACVE: State Advisory Council on Vocational Education
NCRVE: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, Ohio State University
AACJC: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges
NLDC: National Leadership Development Conference
VEEC: Vocational Education Equity Council
NCWGE: National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education
WOW: Wider Opportunities for Women
NACWEP: National Advisory Council for Women's Educational Programs
NASDVE: National Association of State Directors of Vocational Education
NEA: National Education Association
NCLDVE: National Council of Local Directors of Vocational Education
DHEW: Department of Health, Education and Welfare or HEW
OE: Office of Education
BOAE: Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education
BAVE: Bureau of Adult and Vocational Education
DOE: Department of Education
NIE: National Institute of Education
NCES: National Center for Educational Studies
MERC: Management and Evaluation Review
AAUW: American Association of University Women
MOA: Method of Administration
GAO: General Accounting Office
CBO: Community Based Organization
AIR: American Institutes for Research
NAACP: National Association for the Advancement of Colored People

VE/Voc. Ed :	Vocational Education
VEA:	Vocational Education Act
'63 Act:	The Vocational Education Act of 1963
'76 Amendments/Act:	The Education Amendments of 1976: Title II: Vocational Education, Public Law 94-482
'84 Act/CP Act:	Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984, Public Law 98-524

INTRODUCTION

The Congress of the United States has supported and provided financial assistance for vocational education programs and services since the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act in 1917. Subsequently, numerous laws have been enacted to extend, update and enhance vocational education at local, state and national levels.

The primary goal of vocational education is to prepare individuals for gainful employment in occupations which require less than a four-year college degree. Most programs are offered in public educational institutions at the secondary and post-secondary levels. Over the years, many changes have occurred and the legislation has been more responsive to the needs of all individuals and groups who need or want to enter the workplace. Also, the services needed to provide quality programs -- research, professional development of personnel, curriculum, evaluation, and so on -- have received attention under the law. However, the purpose of federal assistance is clear.

> The legislative history and the Act [VEA of 1963] indicate that federal assistance should serve as a catalyst to induce state education agencies [SEA's] and local education agencies [LEA's] to align priorities, programs and expenditures more closely to community and individual needs (16, p. 2).

In recent years, Congress has become more concerned about the implementation of the vocational education legislation and those not being served by local and state agencies, especially at-risk populations. In 1963, provisions to serve disadvantaged and handicapped populations were included in the law. The 1968 amendments set aside funds for these purposes. Essentially, the same thing happened in regard to serving girls and women in vocational education. The Vocational Amendments of 1976 provided the first set-aside funding to eliminate sex discrimination in vocational education. Progress was so limited and so slow that Congress set aside additional funding for sex equity, homemakers and single parents when it approved the Carl D. Perkins Act of 1984.

Following is a detailed history of these two pieces of legislation; why they happened and the results as seen by those most intimately involved.

CHAPTER I

THE LEGISLATION: HEARINGS AND TESTIMONY

> The goal of sex equity is not to make men and women indistinguishable in their public or private lives, rather to ensure complete freedom of choice for both sexes, unhampered by sex bias and sex role stereotyping. ... all institutions in this society, not just schools, must share in the moral and constitutional obligation to promote gender equality. [Sex Equity Coordinator]

As stated in the Introduction, federal support for vocational education had been an accepted fact since the early nineteen hundreds. However, nothing, including education, would be quite the same after the 1960's. The Vocational Education Act of 1963 had been amended in 1968 and was up for reauthorization in 1976. During the preceding years, several critical events occurred and other federal legislation was enacted, which would have a profound effect on the final vocational education bill.

Events in the 60's

- President Kennedy appointed a panel to study vocational education and a major report was issued in 1962 recommending sweeping changes to better serve contemporary labor market needs (102, p. 27).

- In March, 1963, Charles W. Radcliffe became counsel to the Republican members of the House Committee on Education and Labor and served in this capacity for 20 years. (Later, he served as a consultant to AVA and AACJC to draft a bill on provisions to be included in the '84 Law.) (102, p. 26).

- In 1967, Carl D. Perkins became chair of the full House Education and Labor Committee and would serve in this position for 17 years. Most of the education legislation under his leadership had bipartisan support. Republicans Albert Quie of Minnesota and the late John Ashbrook of Ohio, ranking minority leaders during Perkins tenure, also shared an intense interest in vocational education (102, p. 27).

- In 1967, Perkins turned the Chair of the House Subcommittee over to Roman Pucinski of Illinois. Pucinski was the one who brought in "a young Chicago lawyer, John K. (Jack) Jennings" to serve as counsel to the Subcommittee (102, p. 27). Jennings became a supporter of sex equity and a valuable ally in the years ahead.

Discrimination Against Women Hearings

An incredible and eye-opening event took place in Congress during the early 70's. Hearings on Discrimination Against Women were undertaken by the Committee on Education and Labor (69, 70). The Special Subcommittee on Education, chaired by Edith Green of Oregon, held a series of hearings during June and July of 1970. The focus of the hearings was Section 805 of H.R. 16098 which ...

> would amend the Civil Rights Act to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex in federally financed programs and would remove the exemption presently existing in Title VII of the Civil Rights Act with respect to those in education. It would authorize the Civil Rights Commission to study discrimination against women and lastly would remove the exemption of executive, administrative, and professional employees from the equal pay for equal work provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act (69, p. 1).

During the five days of testimony in June, few members of the 15-member House Subcommittee attended the hearings. The selection of Representative Green, the only female on the Subcommittee, as Chair, seems less than coincidental.

The quality and quantity of the statistical and narrative information presented to the Committee was staggering. Representatives of well-known and respected women's groups and credible individuals from across the nation presented facts on the pervasiveness of sex discrimination in all segments of society. Although these hearings stressed higher education (professional) issues, the relationship to all of education was obvious since topics such as discrimination in counseling and employment were explored.

The importance of the legislation under discussion and its future impact was well stated by Wilma Scott Heide of The Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission:

> Compared to other social movements of humankind, this may be the most profound social movement the world has ever known. It poses a fundamental challenge to attitudes and frank mythologies about sex caste divisions of labor and the subservient status of women. It demands basic structural changes in all of our social institutions in ways that are affecting every woman, man, girl and boy. It promises the eradication of sexism, the creation of an androgynous society to replace our androcentric culture and finally a viable democracy to replace male supremacy values (69, p. 136).

She expressed grave concern for favoritism in our laws and the fact that the:

> ... country is now in a position where we can no longer afford to rely on the antediluvian notion that men should rule the world (70, p. 434).

During this time, the notion that girls must be prepared for adult roles as homemaker and as worker was becoming more acceptable. The new life patterns of the modern woman could include marriage, work and a career (69, p. 448). It was obvious that counseling issues had to be addressed if young girls and women were to be successful in achieving a new life style. Nancy Dowding, President of WEAL, came to ask for serious consideration of changes in the counseling services and career choices for girls and women believing that the counseling of young women is not overt discrimination, but a problem of what is not being said to them (69, p. 501-502).

According to Daisey Shaw, Director of Guidance in New York City, ... legislative remedies are not enough. What is needed is a reappraisal of the education and guidance of our youth to determine which factors in our methods of child rearing and schooling are contributing to this tragic and senseless underutilization of American women (69, p. 435-436).

One of the most memorable statements was found in material submitted by a New York State Coalition.

> It is illegal for schools and colleges receiving federal funds to discriminate against students on the basis of race, color, creed or national origin - but nothing stops them from discriminating against women (69, p. 178).

Data were presented on the fact that many more girls than boys graduate from high school but more males enter college, how the history of women has been ignored in education, the limited number of women in high levels of government and how little is being done to change opportunities for women in higher education and training programs.

A long time advocate of women's rights, Representative Patsy Mink of Hawaii, inserted a statement of her support for the bill in the June 26th record. She said:

> Discrimination against women in education is one of the most insidious forms of prejudice extant in our nation. Few people realize the extent to which our society is denied full use of our human resources because of this type of discrimination (69, p. 433).

The hearings continued on July 1 and 31, 1970, with testimony from federal agencies such as the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, the Women's Bureau, Justice Department, Office of Education, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, and Civil Service Commission. Excellent articles and supplemental information from a variety of sources can be found in this report (70).

Representative Shirley Chisholm from the State of New York made a statement which became the foundation of a personal campaign for equal rights for women (70, p. 617-622).

> ... I am very much interested in this whole problem of sex discrimination, and as we go through the legislation on the local, state and federal level, one can really say there are laws on the books if implemented and carried out and enforced and if they were, it won't be necessary to have this hearing today.
>
> For the life of me, I can't understand how we can continue to be so uptight about whether a person wears a dress or a pair of pants, as to whether that person can use their God given talents to make whatever constructive contributions they can make to this country.
>
> The prejudice against women has gone unnoticed by most persons precisely because it is so pervasive and thorough-going that it seems to us to be normal.
>
> ... if we ever succeed, as we must succeed if we are to survive in rooting out the racism that is such a prominent part of our American heritage, we will still be very far from being a just society if we are not also ready to accord full human dignity to women.

Representative Chisholm's words and actions on behalf of women had a profound impact on future legislation initiatives, especially in vocational education.

The oversight hearings on discrimination against women continued in 1972. Representative Edith Green of Oregon continued to serve as Chair of the sessions held in April and May of that year. Most of the testimony related to a plan for educational renewal in the country, discrimination in contracts and grants and the Right to Read Program.

A report on the Women's Action Program was included in the record (70, p. 243). The forward by Elliot Richardson, then Secretary of HEW, outlined the purpose of the Women's Action Program. Essentially it had been established:

> ... to work with people within the Department [HEW] to identify, understand and overcome the many forms and sources of sex discrimination that flaw the Department as a place to work (70, p. 245).

A review of programs administered by the Department was undertaken, including job training programs. The report included specific recommendations for vocational education programs:

1) Legislation should be developed by the Office of Education specifying that all HEW-supported vocational education programs shall be conducted without sex discrimination.

2) The Office of Education should encourage state advisory councils, within the restrictions of their membership requirements, to increase the number and percentage of women members so as to better respond to the needs of women. State councils should be requested to submit to the Commissioner of Education a list of current members and their expiration dates, along with plans for recruiting minorities and women.

3) The Office of Education should consider requesting a legislative amendment which specifies that for a state to be eligible for federal assistance for vocational education, it must submit for approval by the Office of Education a five-year plan for equalizing vocational education programs for both sexes (70, p. 325).

Documentation of discrimination against women within the Department of HEW was presented. Although women made up 63.1% of the HEW workforce, they held only 14.4% of grade 13-18 positions; while only 36.9% of the workforce was male, they held 85.6% of the top leadership roles (72, p. 270).

Sidney Marland, Commissioner of Education, established a task force in April, 1971 to study problems of job discrimination against women and to make recommendations for eliminating discriminatory practices. He appointed a full time Federal Women's Program Coordinator, Joan Thompson to assist the office in carrying out its program (72, p. 6).

Other testimony at these hearings was presented by Dr. Florence Hicks, Director of the Women's Action Program in HEW; Dr. Vera Brown, Director of the Federal Women's Program in HEW; and Judge Elizabeth Athanasakos, Chairman of the Advisory Committee on the Rights and Responsibilities of Women. It was obvious that sex discrimination permeated all levels of the educational bureaucracy and someone needed to clean house.

Implications of the Vocational Education Amendments of the 1968 Hearings

In November, 1971, the General Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, chaired by Representative Roman C. Pucinski of Illinois, held hearings on the Implications of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968. These oversight hearings contained reports from state directors of vocational education and state advisory councils from 50 states and the District of Columbia, describing how the law had been implemented (71).

Five reports of the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education were included (71). Attention focused on disadvantaged and minority populations and "education for someone else's children." Almost no attention was given to sex discrimination except to refer to the need to serve women as well as men in vocational education. The term chairman was used throughout these documents when referring to Council leaders. The Council's major concern included: curriculum development, coordination among agencies, the disadvantaged, attitudes toward vocational education and the reorganization of the U.S. Office of Education. Lack of finances and planning were seen as the most critical issues. An example of bias in the January 1971 NACVE report was:

> A school cannot offer welding to seventeen year old boys in the tenth grade, subcontract welding instruction to a welding shop in neighborhood ... because such irregularities violate the definition and impair the subsidy (71, p. 16).

In the June, 1971 Council report, it was stated that consideration should be given to:

> The highly motivated working poor stuck in low-skill, low-paying jobs, who need to hold two jobs to earn enough income to cover their family needs... The mothers of school age children who need and want to re-enter the labor market (71, p. 20).

Concern was expressed by the major groups that testified at the hearings for more and better data collection procedures. Ultimately, it would be the implementation of this request, that so many said was needed, that would highlight the extent of sex discrimination in vocational education.

The State Advisory Committee's 1970 reports made recommendations relative to improving vocational counseling but did not talk about the need to encourage girls/young women to enroll in non-traditional programs or to eliminate biased counseling. Two state reports that addressed sex equity issues were Illinois and Indiana. The State of Illinois recommended support for:

> ... programs initiating new and upgrading traditional programs meaningful to women at the skill, technical and semi-professional level to encourage a greater number of women to become involved in vocational and technical education (71, p. 75).

Indiana recommended that:

> ... the establishment and support of programs meaningful to women at the skill or craft level, and in technical and professional areas of training be encouraged. Women represent over 35% of the labor force, but they get little preparation for wage-earning except in clerical and health fields (71, p. 76).

Reports and testimony of state directors of vocational education focused on career education, improved guidance and counseling services, area vocational facilities and programs for disadvantaged and handicapped students (71, p. 237). Statistical reports did not separate male/female enrollments and the only attention to equity was to provide vocational/occupationally oriented home economics programs.

The Education Amendments of 1972: Title IX

On July 1, 1972, the Education Amendments of 1972 became law. These amendments included Title IX which said all education programs receiving federal aid must give females equal standing with males (see Appendix). These Amendments along with the Civil Rights Laws of 1963 and 1964, making discrimination against women in employment illegal, provided the legal platform on which subsequent legislation was built. The Office for Civil Rights was assigned responsibility for enforcing Title IX (21, p. 1), after the final regulations were issued by HEW and signed by President Ford three years later in July, 1975.

A 1981 document, Title IX: The Half Full, Half Empty Glass, (56) published by the National Advisory Council on Women's Education Programs, provides an excellent overview of the legislation, its purpose, and impact over the preceding nine year period. Improvement in opportunities for women was cited under "How Does It All Add Up?"

> ... the glass remains half empty ... with much still to be done to fulfill the promises of Title IX. Title IX has been the foundation for countless successes in schools, colleges and communities across the nation. It must continue if American girls and women are to reach truly equal opportunities in educational preparation for life (56, p. 52).

Because the law was not being implemented:

> ... WEAL filed class action charges against hundreds of colleges which had contracts with the federal government, charging them with sex discrimination in employment (56, p. 1).

Women's Educational Equity Act (WEEA)

The House of Representatives of the Ninety-Third Congress held hearings on H.R. 208, a bill better known as the Women's Educational Equity Act (WEEA). The Subcommittee on Equal Opportunities of the Committee on Education and Labor, met in July and September, 1973 and was chaired by Representative Patsy Mink of Hawaii (73).

Numerous women's groups presented critical testimony which contained the results of research and actual examples of sex discrimination in all aspects of education. Arvonne Fraser, President of the Women's Equity Action League (WEAL), addressed vocational and career education and highlighted sex stereotyping in training programs in public schools (73, p. 7).

> Arvonne Fraser was one of the first to focus on vocational education. She had originally intended that the Women's Educational Equity Act (WEEA) cover vocational training, but WEEA was too small a program to address this issue in depth (50, p. 69).

A study of the Dallas Independent School District, completed by WEAL, was included in the record and detailed sex discrimination in counseling, curriculum and educational materials (73, p. 7).

An extensive report entitled, A Look at Women in Education: Issues and Answers for HEW, by the OE Commissioner's Task Force (Sidney P. Marland, Jr., Commissioner) was presented by Dr. Bernice Sandler (73, p. 57). She headed a twelve-member task force which had been established "in the wake of rising public concern about discrimination against women" to investigate the impact of Office of Education programs on women (73, p. 57). NIE and the Office for Civil Rights were also included in the study. Vocational education programs came under intense scrutiny and the report emphasized discriminatory practices in courses and segregated academic and vocational schools (73, p. 60).

> So long as the schools continue to steer girls into vocational training for low-pay jobs, they will continue to contribute to the earnings gap between working women and working men (73, p. 61).

The problems of the pregnant teenager were found to be especially severe since these girls were usually expelled from school with little hope of becoming self-supporting.

> ... vocational and manpower programs, wittingly or unwittingly, are helping to channel the bulk of the Nation's female workers into low-paying jobs [because they are segregated by sex] (73, p. 72).

The new concept of Career Education which could be instrumental in changing old attitudes and myths seemed to be following the same segregated track. The Task Force found samples of sex bias in materials and tests produced by NIE and OE and the report recommended "that equality for the sexes in education be declared an official priority of both OE and NIE" (73, p. 94). The following specific recommendation on the Vocational Education Act was included:

> Vocational Education Act, Parts C, D and I:
> Funds could be used in projects which study the obstacles to women's full participation in all areas of vocational education, demonstrate approaches to breaking down sex stereotypes in vocational education and develop curriculum materials which counteract career sex stereotypes (73, p. 95).

A copy of the Minnesota State Board of Education policies regarding sex equity in public schools were placed in the Congressional Record. The State Board requested that school counselors:

> ... encourage students to consider careers in accordance with their interests and abilities regardless of the traditional roles or careers (73, p. 261).

Letters from several State Commissions on the Status of Women provided support for the legislation.

The National Organization for Women (NOW) reported on sex bias in the public schools of New York, based on complaints received from parents of elementary school children. Restrictions and discriminatory requirements for enrollment in home economics and industrial arts were commonplace as well as the slow pace of accepting women into previously desegregated technical schools.

> The favoritism for males over female students stands out in a particularly blatant way in the system of vocational education (73, p. 327).

A Guide for Pupils and Parents, approved by the Board of Education in New York City in 1970-1971, included a separate listing of "His" and "Her" vocational and technical courses (73, p. 344-345).

The Senate held hearings on the Women's Educational Equity Act in the Fall, 1973. S.B. 2518 was a bill:

> ... to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to make grants to conduct special educational programs and activities designed to achieve educational equity for all students, men and women, and for other related educational purposes (74, p. I).

Although the title of the bill was Women's Educational Equity, the purpose included "all students, men and women." This fact may have been lost on many people.

The Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was chaired by Senator Clairborne Pell of Rhode Island. On October 17, 1973, however, Senator Walter F. Mondale presided over the hearings and expressed his concern about sex equity (74).

> ... it has been a very unsettling experience for many of us to learn -- as a result of the work done in recent years by the women's movement -- that for years the educational system has actually been discriminating against the majority of our population -- women (74, p. 1-2).

This bill (S.B. 2518) included specific terminology of particular interest to vocational educators --

> ... to provide improved career, vocational and physical education programs by providing funds for ... research, development, and dissemination of curriculums, texts and materials, nondiscriminatory tests, and programs for adequate and nondiscriminatory vocational education and career counseling for women (74, p. 4-8).

Arvonne Fraser, President of WEAL, reaffirmed many of the comments she had made to the House Committee considering the same bill. Her remarks on vocational and career education gave attention to biased testing, training and retraining of guidance counselors "... so that sex stereotyping in vocational and career education will stop" (74, p. 26), and the need to provide role models of women in non-traditional occupations.

Two representatives from the University of Minnesota talked about inequities in vocational and technical educational programs and supported the expansion of vocational and career education programs. One person stated that she believed:

> ... the categorical programs supported by HEW have their own priorities. The aim of the vocational education program, for example, is not to help women but to support vocational education (74, p. 40).

Senator Mondale pressed those in attendance with the question, "Is it your impression that vocational education is more heavily discriminatory or segregated on a sex basis than other aspects of education?" (74, p. 68). Nancy Schlossberg, Director of the Office of Women in Higher Education, American Council on Education said, "I think it has been [so] traditionally" (74, p. 68). Ann Scott of NOW spoke to the need for more and better research and that the Office of Education should provide figures on vocational education -- "It is their job" (74, p. 70), she said.

The same report that was shared with the House Committee discussing the WEEA was presented to this group (Commissioner's Task Force on the Impact of OE Programs on Women, chaired by Holly Knox and Frances Kelly). The report outlined "Limitations in Vocational Education" (74, p. 149).

> Justifications for this kind of rank discrimination range from the well meaning -- 'She won't be able to get a job' -- to the absurd -- 'We can't let girls do metal work because they have to wear masks and work with sparks.' Whatever the excuse, schools must stop denying students free choice in vocational training.
>
> The fact is that some women want training in vocations now dominated by men, and vice versa. Women have succeeded, despite tremendous resistance, in all of these fields; during World War II the popular 'Rosie the Riveter' served as evidence that women were effectively replacing men in many industry jobs. Sex discrimination in employment has been illegal since 1964; now it is illegal in vocational schools, too.
>
> Equality in job training is not a minor concern for women. Despite the persistent myth that 'woman's place is in the home', women are now a permanent and growing sector of the

> work force. Within the past thirty years, the number of women in the work force has more than doubled, so that today two out of every five workers are women. Nearly two-thirds of the new jobs created during the 1960's were held by women.
>
> Nor are women only temporarily employed or merely working for 'pin money'. Seventy percent of all women employed are working full time, and the average woman worker has a full time worklife expectancy of 25 years. Nearly half the women employed in 1971 were working because of pressing economic need.
>
> So long as the schools continue to steer girls into vocational training for low-paying jobs, they will continue to contribute to the earnings gap between working women and working men. That gap is substantial and growing worse. In 1955, a woman working full time earned only 64% of a man's earnings, but by 1970, she was only earning 59% as much (74, p. 160).

Also, the report stated that vocational and manpower training programs sponsored by OE:

> ... tend to train women for a much narrower range of occupations than men -- occupations which usually promise little pay, poor chances for advancement, and minimal challenge. By and large, male trainees select from a far greater range of training opportunities, resulting in relatively higher paid skilled trade and technical jobs (74, p. 180).

A recommendation directly affecting the profession of vocational education was made by the task force.

> The Director of NIE's Career Education Task Force and the Deputy Commissioner for Occupational and Adult Education [should] speak before the American Vocational Association and other key vocational groups on the need to encourage young men and women to explore the entire range of vocational opportunities (74, p. 203).

The National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs was established under the original Women's Educational Equity Act. The 20 members of the Council, 17 appointed by the President and three ex-offico members, were to make policy recommendations to Federal officials regarding the improvement of education equity for women (74, p. 151). Also, the Council was required to review and provide advice on WEEA programs plus all Federal policies and programs affecting women's educational equity at all levels. Since its inception, the Council had focused attention on Title IX, subsequently it became involved in the vocational education legislation.

Vocational Education Act of 1963: Reauthorization Hearings (Vocational Amendments of 1976)

The 93rd Congressional Hearings on H.R. 14454, a Bill to Extend the Authorization of Appropriations for the Vocational Education Act of 1963, were held from May through September, 1974 in Washington, DC and at four other locations throughout the country (75). Limited attention was given to the sex equity provisions of the legislation; in fact, it was difficult to find many references to sex equity in the testimony.

A statement by the Executive Director of SACVE in North Carolina included a recommendation that the new legislation should provide:

> 6.e. Assurances of non-discrimination because of sex, race, nationality or economic, social, physical and/or mental handicapping conditions (75, p. 111).

No set-aside funding was recommended.

A local director from the same state confirmed that Part B funds from the '68 Act enabled, "Opening all programs to all individuals regardless of sex, color, race or creed" (75, p. 137).

Representatives of youth organizations (FHA and FFA) spoke about the benefits derived from the legislation. The FFA state president from Connecticut, a young woman said,

> When I started in 1969, girls were not allowed as members on the national level, although they were allowed membership on the state level. Today, we enjoy all privileges of national membership (75, p. 182).

Mildred Reel, FHA's National Director provided testimony to show that consumer and homemaking programs, including FHA, had a impact on lessening teenage pregnancy (75, p. 171). The national executive secretary of FFA, William Paul Gray, indicated that one of the group's major accomplishments was that:

> Minority groups, both girls and blacks, have exemplified outstanding personal qualities and many have received honors on the local, state and national levels (75, p. 179).

The Minnesota State Advisory Council for Vocational Education identified "the need for more practical methods of assuring equal opportunity for all students, regardless of race, national origin or sex" (75, p. 364) and recommended expanding action programs for minorities. However, the vocational education needs of women were not mentioned specifically. The Chairman [author's emphasis] of NACVE presented a report for inclusion in the hearings on Women in Vocational Education which was not discussed at the time (75, p. 451). Later, Chair Carl Perkins of the House Committee asked for more information on the findings in the report. Dorothy Thompson, Chair of the Minnesota SACVE, the group that had prepared the report, responded by letter. She said:

> In a two-year study of Women in Vocational Education, this Advisory Council found that vocational education serves to perpetuate the traditional female role in our society. While 37% of the students in AVTI's are women, nine out of every ten women are enrolled in such 'women-dominated' courses as home economics, health occupations, homemaking, and clerical programs. This, we have found, has been encouraged by the recruiting and counseling practices of the AVTI's. May I also add that in the Division of Vocational Education there is one woman in a policy-making position. All of the AVTI directors are male (75, p. 563).

Two Minnesota programs, preparation of truck drivers and farriers, had gained recognition primarily because women had enrolled in them (75, p. 368).

The July 31, 1974 record included a copy of a study, Legislative Proposals for Vocational Education, completed by Melvin L. Barlow of California and Victor Van Hook of Oklahoma, for the National Association of State Directors of Vocational Education. Recommendations in the report that related to sex equity follow: (75)

1) NACVE - in appointing membership, the Council President shall ensure appropriate cross-sectional representation on the basis of sex, minorities and geography (p. 621).

2) SAVCE - the appointing authority shall be responsible for achievement of balanced representation with regard to geography, sex and ethnicity (p. 626).

3) Comprehensive Statewide Planning - plans must provide for supplementary vocational education for adults who have entered or are re-entering, the labor market ... and ... preparatory instruction for adults who are entering the labor market for the first time (p. 630).

4) Prevocational Education - many individuals, older, minority, and female [are] left out of meaningful roles in our culture (p. 634).

5) Consumer and Homemaking Education - Funds may be used for programs for the dual role of homemaker and wage earner (p. 668).

6) Student Support Programs and Stipends - provide support services for men and women -- unemployed, under-employed, disadvantaged or handicapped -- who need the education and training provided by post secondary adult vocational education programs (p. 686).

It is interesting to note that the generic "he" and words such as "manpower" and "craftsman" were commonly used throughout this report.

In July, the American Vocational Association appeared before the Committee but had no prepared text and did not express strong support for sex equity. An August 1 statement by Eugene Bottoms, then Vice President of the Guidance Section of AVA, made reference to women being in a limited number of occupations and that female college graduates were doing clerical work (75, p. 744). However, no specific recommendation relative to sex equity in guidance was presented.

At hearings in late August in Washington State, Representative Quie of the House Committee, expressed concern over female enrollment patterns. He noted that increases were primarily in home and family life and vocational agriculture, not in other areas as had been proposed as an expected result of the 1968 Amendments (75, p. 1007).

On November 3, 1975, Senator Walter Mondale introduced a bill which he referred to as The Women's Vocational Education Amendments of 1975. S.B. 203, a bill to amend The Vocational Education Act of 1963, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare (121, p. 34668).

Senator Mondale's strong support for sex equity was an important factor in the subsequent provisions of the Amendments of 1976.

> Evidence of [this] ambivalence toward the increased training needs of women as well as all phases of vocational education is abundant and convincing (121, p. 34668).

The purpose of this bill was:

> ... to advance the full participation of both sexes in vocational education in a variety of areas including administration -- both at the national and state level -- counseling, curriculum development and materials, as well as research and training, to mention only a few (121, p. 34668).

The National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education (NCWGE) proposed the full-time sex equity coordinator position which Jack Jennings felt had a better chance of passage in the House than Senator Mondale's version which called for an Office of Women's Affairs. The Coalition worked to amend the House version of the bill in an attempt to get stronger language added -- which they really didn't believe would survive because the vocational organizations didn't support the sex equity provisions.

Radcliffe states that the influence of AVA on the content of the 1976 Amendments was due in part to:

> a growing awareness in Congress of massive changes occurring in the American workforce, and a deepening concern that not nearly enough was being done to respond to them (102, p. 27) [and]

> ... the emphasis on sex equity ... came about because the single most dramatic change in the American labor market at that time was the massive entry of women on a full time basis (102, p. 28).

Opposition was strong from the home economics community. Mary A. Jolley served as lobbyist for the American Home Economics Association and worked with Shirley Downs, Aide to Representative Shirley Chisholm, to develop amendments which would not delete or infringe on the role of consumer and homemaking legislation. When the Amendments made it to the Conference Committee in the Summer of 1976, Shirley Chisholm was adamant about retaining the full-time coordinator position with a budget to support it and that women be named to state advisory councils. These critical components of the bill, plus programs for displaced homemakers and demonstrated provisions of equal opportunity in state plans, received approval of the Conference Committee (Millsap, 50, p. 72).

The House Committee on Education and Labor's report on the '76 Amendments (May, 1976) contained specifics for eliminating sex discrimination and sex stereotyping in vocational education (78, p. 42). New directions were charted as states were required to take on "a very heavy responsibility" to carry out the provisions of the law (78, p. 43). One of the key requirements, which would have great impact in later years, was that data would be collected and reported according to sex.

> The Commissioner [U.S.] of Education was charged with conducting a study to determine how efforts to eliminate sex bias and sex stereotyping have succeeded and report on these results to Congress within two years of the date of enactment of these amendments (78, p. 43).

Representative Meeds of New York spoke in support of the Vocational Education Amendments (H.R. 12835). He stated that the bill "... charged the States with moving aggressively to eliminate sex stereotyping and sex bias in vocational education (123, p. 13375) and felt that two years of hearings and hard work had resulted in a good bill. Representative Mink of Hawaii expressed her pleasure with "... the amendments adopted by the committee to expand opportunities for women in vocational education and to eliminate sex bias and discrimination" (123, p. 13375). She stressed that the act makes this clear in its declaration of purpose. Other important elements were: to mandate membership of women on the national and state advisory councils who have had experience with problems related to sex equity, to include methods used to eliminate sex bias and stereotyping in federal reports, to improve instructional materials and to provide supportive services for women (123, p. 13375).

Advocates who tracked the vocational education legislation after its passage, for the Coalition for Women and Girls in Education, were Janet Wells and Linda Brown who were with the Lawyer's Committee for Civil Rights Under Law. Attention was now focused on BOAE to see if the office would write strong regulations for enforcing the law since it had not been supportive prior to passage. The Coalition responded to the "Notice of Intent to Propose Rulemaking" published in November, 1976. BOAE released proposed regulations with a brief comment period. The Coalition and the National Advisory Council for Women's Educational Programs (NACWEP) worked together to strengthen the regulations and in May, 1977 charged BOAE with "abdicating" its responsibilities to interpret and implement the amendments. The proposed regulations were weaker than the law (50, p. 74-78).

By July, the final regulations had not been issued. The Coalition sought a meeting with HEW Secretary Joseph A. Califano, Jr. to discuss a variety of items including the need to issue the regulations. As a result, he instructed his staff "to move!" Mary Berry, then Assistant Secretary, and her special assistant, Leslie R. Wolfe, were in favor of stronger language in the regulations and were able to achieve the results they desired because of those instructions from the Secretary and the comments that had been gathered by the Coalition and the Council (50, p. 78).

The regulations were published in the Federal Register (128) on October 3, 1977 and included the following statements:

> These regulations implement the Vocational Education Act of 1963 as completely revised by the Education Amendments of 1976 ... Generally, the regulations are designed to assist states to improve planning in the use of all resources for vocational education and to overcome sex discrimination in vocational education.

The rule-making history of the Act follows:

1) Published in Federal Register after Act passed (41, FR 49742) a Notice of Intent to Issue Regulations (NOI), November 10, 1976.

2) 65-day comment period followed:
    a) November 22 - January 15, 1977 - Public hearings held in each state - 66 meetings attended by 6,000 people.
    b) 600 letters and telephone calls received.

3) Proposed regulations drafted at end of 65 days.

4) Notice of Proposal Rulemaking (NPRM) published in Federal Register (42 FR 18542), April 7, 1977.
    a) Included rules: overview of regulations.
    b) 30-day comment period followed.
    c) Press release sent to 450 local organizations and newspapers regarding NPRM and schedule of public hearings.

5) Public meetings held in 10 HEW Regional sites from April 20 through April 29
   a) Letters of invitation sent to 10,000 individuals and organizations.
   b) 700 letters received plus formal statements at meetings.

6) Final regulations significantly altered by intense public involvement (October 3, 1977). Public encouraged to continue input for continued revision may be needed.

7) Effective date - 45 days following date of transmission to Congress and publication in Federal Register (from October 3, 1977).

Although the Civil Rights laws of 1963 and 1964 make discrimination against women in employment illegal and Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972 said all education programs receiving federal aid must give females equal standing with males, the Vocational Education Amendments went further.

> Congress concluded that the nation's vocational education system should go beyond nondiscrimination and should take positive steps aimed at narrowing the disparities between women's and men's employment and earnings opportunities (21, p. 5).

Sex Discrimination and Sex Stereotyping in Vocational Education: Hearings

The most important hearings held on the subject of sex discrimination in vocational education were chaired by Representative Shirley Chisholm of New York and Patsy Mink of Hawaii, long time advocates for sex equity (76). These hearings were held by the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education during the 94th Session of Congress in March and April, 1975. Key people from inside and outside the government presented testimony and a great deal of statistical information was placed before the Subcommittee.

Dr. Marilyn Steele, with the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, emphasized that the way to correct inequities in vocational education was to, "Enforce the law! ... segregated classes are illegal" (76, p. 23). In addition, she said:

> Vocational education must provide a variety of training programs for persons of all ages, especially those with special needs -- and it is plausible to consider women as a less advantaged group. Vocational educators who recognize the potential social and economic impact of vocational education cannot continue to ignore the needs of half their students. Once we eliminate stereotyping in the schools, girls and boys will have greater freedom to choose satisfying careers and life roles (76, p. 24).

Dr. Steele shared a major report on Women in Vocational Education which she had prepared under the auspices of Project Baseline at Northern Arizona University for the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education (114). This report, one of the few comprehensive studies of its kind, presented findings and recommendations of great importance.

The focus of Dr. Steele's testimony was on (1) restrictive enrollment practices, (2) discrimination on policy boards, (3) discrimination in instructional practice, and (4) female school dropouts. Her comments were strong and to the point. A few follow: (76, p. 9-12).

> The educational organization is a pyramid dominated by men.
>
> ... The socially determined custom, accepted and reinforced by our public schools of preselection of occupation by sex, perpetuates the problems of low wages for women in adult life.
>
> ... An elitist philosophy pervades the school system, that academic learning is superior to manual dexterity.
>
> Secondary vocational education customarily discriminates against both female students and female teachers.
>
> Women are not represented in elected or appointed positions, decision-making roles, at either the state or the national level but women are two-thirds of the complete aggregation in vocational-technical education.

Problems related to women in the workforce were reinforced by Nancy Perlman, Director, Congress of Labor Union Women. Dr. Jo Ann Steiger, President of Steiger, Fink and Smith, Inc., stated:

> I was dismayed to find that many vocational educators, including some of the most influential ones, regard the vocational and technical needs of women as inconsequential. Some refuse to concede there is a problem. Others view the matter as one of the lowest priority (76, p. 18-31).

She recommended establishment of an Office of Women and Work within the State Departments of Vocational Education (79, p. 32) and noted that:

> The advisory council [national] has made no statement whatso-ever anywhere in their publications on this issue [sex equity]. There was one member of the advisory council who was beginning to speak out quite forcefully. Her name is Martha Bachman. Her term expired. She was not reappointed (76, p. 49).

Recommendations on how to help ameliorate sex discrimination occurring under the Vocational Education Act were presented by representatives from the Women's Rights Project, Center for Law and Social Policy. They focused on the legal aspects of reporting, grievance procedures, sanctions, oversight hearings, and so on; the point being that discrimination is illegal (76, p. 161).

PEER (Project on Equal Educational Rights) monitored Federal laws bearing on sex discrimination. PEER Director, Holly Knox, discussed HEW's failure in enforcing Title IX (76, p. 178). This was supported by other testimony. Evidence was presented that:

> OCR has come to realize the extent and nature of civil rights problems in the vocational education area (76, p. 206).

Cooperative efforts on the part of local, state and federal education and civil rights officials were recommended.

Dr. William F. Pierce, Deputy Commissioner for Occupational and Adult Education, USOE identified four major areas of concern: (1) the concentration of women in four occupational fields, (2) lack of flexible scheduling, (3) guidance counselors and materials which promote sex stereotyping, and (4) the traditional attitudes of society (76, p. 224).

The "blatant sex discrimination" in career interest inventories was emphasized by Dr. Corinne Reider, Assistant Director of Career Education Program at NIE (79, p. 249). Mr. Raymond C. Parrott, Executive Director of the Massachusetts Advisory Council on Vocational-Technical Education (who later became Director of the National Advisory Council) made this honest remark:

> I would be less than fair to suggest that the Council is the key group interested in the elimination of sex bias in occupational education, or even the major group, with these concerns. We are simply one group among many trying to change what is going on (76, p. 68).

An article in the Congressional Record by Pamela Roby, entitled, "Vocational Education and Women" included the following:

> It is questionable whether any significant steps could be taken to break out of the mold from within the vocational education structure where stereotypes of male-female roles abound. Though 36% of the women who get B.A.'s receive them in education, a paucity are trained in vocational education, industrial arts or educational administration. The educational hierarchy is a pyramid with women making up the base and very few or none at the top. The administrators and policy makers are predominately male (76, p. 122).

Current Issues in Vocational Education Hearings

The House Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education began four days of oversight hearings in September, 1980 as an early step toward reauthorization of the 1976 Amendments (81). Testimony was presented by the vocational leadership including representatives from AVA, NIE (Vocational Education Study), NCRVE, NCES, AACJC and other research groups.

Statistics on enrollments were presented to show the extent to which single-sex dominance still existed. Some tried to paint a rosy picture by showing that health and home economics had enrolled more males, that there was an almost equal balance in distribution, and that significant shifts had occurred in agriculture. Considerable attention was placed on:

> What the ideal balance is, whether it is 50-50 as the population might be distributed, or whether individuals left absolutely to their own choices with no external bias or pressures would choose an imbalance, I would not even want to speculate; but we just wanted to show you today what changes have occurred since the 1976 Amendments (81, p. 7).

The "self-selection concept" was used more than once as a possible reason for inequities. However, it was obvious from the data that single sex concentration by program persisted. This was also the case with minority enrollments and school types (81, p. 47). Other study results showed that traditional occupational patterns for the sexes are the norm and the shifts, since 1972, were toward mixed programs (those with 25-75% female) rather than non-traditional areas (81, p. 113).

There was always support for "giving students freedom to choose programs and to have access to those programs" (comment by AVA, 81, p. 218), from most individuals and groups but there was seldom any direct reference to sex equity as an important concern in vocational education. The thing that is most surprising is that girls and women were identified as a target group under the '76 Act, yet the vocational leadership did not provide the Committee with much information on strategies and results of activities designed to address this target group. A large portion of the hearings focused on the effectiveness of vocational education programs and follow-up of graduates.

Discussions between committee members and those testifying seemed to trigger anecdotes related to equity issues. Members of Congress became more aware of how the lack of equity was impacting their own family members. Also, there was some opposition to vocational education as an acceptable program for students, especially girls -- "For females, vocational track membership seems to have created a disadvantage in the labor force" (81, p. 451). This remark, and others by a representative of the ML-Group for Policy Studies on Education Cemrel, Inc., stimulated the following response:

> Harnischfeger's finding of lower earnings for white females from vocational programs is contrary to most other results from national studies...[Grasso and Shea studies are cited]... In terms of hourly rates of pay and annual earnings, only among female graduates is their clear evidence of an advantage to those who completed occupational programs in high school, and the positive effect is as large for young black women as for white (81, p. 1173).

The NIE Interim Study of Vocational Education (67), mandated by the Law, had just been released and was included in the Committee Record (81, p. 909). Here again, this report highlighted patterns of enrollment by sex (p. 863). As a result, the most significant impact of these hearings for sex equity was that the data presented an obviously sex segregated vocational educational system at all levels.

The Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984: Reauthorization Hearings on the Vocational Act of 1963

Millsap (50) believes that the low-key persistent congressional lobbying by the Coalition for Women and Girls in Education between 1980-1984 paid off. In 1980, the Coalition prepared a position paper proposing changes in the '76 legislation and recommended that 15% of the basic grant be set aside for sex equity activities. The climate was not supportive of change. The tendency was to streamline legislation and it took a great deal of political savvy to influence Congress and the professional community. The Coalition was able to turn back the administration's attempts to dilute the sex equity coordinator's position in the Fall, 1981. Each year, they focused on reauthorization by preparing position papers, holding meetings with key organizations and constantly working the Hill (50, p. 198).

House hearings on reauthorization held in February, 1981, focused on vocational education in different institutional settings and in urban and rural areas (82). Rosemary Kolde, AVA President, administrative specialist, and long time advocate of sex equity from Great Oaks Jt. Vocational School District in Cincinnati, Ohio, appeared before the Subcommittee on February 25, 1981 (82, p. 118-316). In the appendix of the record for the following day was an article by Faith Dunne of Dartmouth College entitled, "They'd Never Hire a Girl: Vocational Education in Rural Secondary Schools" (82, p. 422-470).

Hearings were held in Ashland and Lexington, Kentucky on March 13-14, 1981, on the reauthorization of the '63 Act (84). The focus was on proposed cuts in federal funding. In addition, representatives from Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio and West Virginia participated. Cuts in school lunch programs were up for debate also. Presidents of numerous state education associations spoke against proposed cuts. Postsecondary issues were addressed in July, 1982 (87). The occupational information aspects of the legislation (NOICC-SOICC) were reviewed on August 3, 1982 by the House

Subcommittee (88) and local vocational programs were discussed on August 18 (89). The hearings focused on the status of programs in Kentucky (It is important to restate that the strong and effective Chair of the House Committee was Carl D. Perkins of Kentucky).

> ... by 1982, it appeared that both the House and the Senate were behind the continuation of sex equity coordinators (50, p. 200).

There was a serious question for a while whether Perkins would deal with the Act during the 1983 Session of Congress. In the meantime, bills had been prepared by the House, by Senator Hatch of Utah, in the Senate; the Administration and AVA; but movement was slow. In early 1983, Perkins proposed extending the current law so that hearings could be held. According to Millsap, forty-four hearings were held over the next two years (50, p. 200).

The Administration's bill proposed the elimination of the sex equity coordinator's position. The administration's representatives; Terrel H. Bell, Secretary of Education; and Robert M. Worthington, Assistant Secretary for Vocational and Adult Education, supported an effort to consolidate vocational and adult education appropriations for fiscal years '84-'88 at a hearing in May, 1983 (92).

The House Bill (H.R. 4164) was introduced by Chairman Perkins on October 19, 1983. The ranking Republican on the Subcommittee, William Goodling of Pennsylvania, was the principal co-sponsor along with 21 other co-sponsors from both parties (102). Oversight hearings on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education were held in October, 1983 in three Virginia locations (93). They were designed to examine the adequacy of federal aid policies and programs. Little attention was given to equity issues. In November of the same year, the Vocational-Technical Education Act of 1983 hearings by the Subcommittee were crucial in stimulating Congress to consider the specific needs of women and girls for vocational education programs and services (95). The bill, H.R. 4164, included provisions to require states to expand vocational education opportunities for women and authorized development of programs to eliminate sex discrimination in federally funded programs (95).

At hearings on November 1, the National Education Association was represented by Linda Tarr-Whelan, Director of Government Relations. She stated:

> The NEA firmly believes that the role of the federal government should be to improve, enhance and maintain the quality of current vocational education programs, and to provide expanded access and equity to quality programs for those previously underserved -- people of color, women, the economically disadvantaged, and the handicapped (95, p. 181-238).

Special attention was given to women in vocational education and NEA recommended that current provisions for women's equity be strengthened through a stronger and more effective role for the sex equity coordinators at the state level. In addition, it was recommended that $50 million of each year's basic grant appropriation be reserved to fund Grants to Overcome Sex Bias (95, p. 181-238).

Janet Wells of the Federal Education Project presented testimony on behalf of nine other groups on November 3, 1983 (95, p. 348-373). Her purpose was to highlight problems with the bill under consideration. She cited the following example of why Congress must be prescriptive in how funds are distributed and used. She stated:

> ... when Robert Worthington (OVAE Assistant Secretary) was told in May, 1983 that states did not have full time sex equity coordinators, he replied, 'Education is a state function. You can't tell a state superintendent what to do anymore'.

Wells' criticism of H.R. 4164 was extensive and detailed. She made it clear to the Committee that there were many loopholes in the bill and the lack of specificity would seriously harm efforts to eliminate sex discrimination in vocational education. She was an expert on the legislation, and Committee members listened! Later she would be subjected to verbal attacks by some members of the vocational education community who opposed the sex equity aspects of the bill.

Theresa Cusick presented testimony on behalf of the NCWGE on November 3. She stated that seven states accounted for almost two-thirds of the funds spent for sex equity under the '76 Amendments. She stressed the need to provide a mechanism to guarantee funding for programs for women (95, p. 348-373).

On November 9, Marie Mayor represented VEEC at the Subcommittee Hearings. The need for a data system which identified enrollments by sex and race, and the importance of servicing special female populations (ie., displaced homemakers, teenage parents) were stressed in her presentation (95, p. 390-478).

> Finally, in March, 1984 the House voted 373 to 4 on the new Vocational Education Act. Five percent of the basic state grant was to be spent on programs that eliminated sex stereotyping (50).

The bill that was finally approved by the House was essentially the bill prepared by AVA/AACJA. There was much disagreement between the House and Senate versions. The Senate leaned toward using most of the federal funds to serve "special needs populations" rather than "for improvement, upgrading and modernization of the basic program available to all students" (103, p. 28).

The Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources was chaired by Orrin G. Hatch of Utah. The Subcommittee was chaired by Robert T. Stafford of Vermont. Although Paula Hawkins of Florida served on the committee, she was not a member of the Subcommittee. It is interesting to note that four of the ten Subcommittee members, plus the chair, were New Englanders.

On July 1, 1982, the Senate Subcommittee met to consider S. 2325, a bill to amend the Vocational Education Act and the Adult Education Act, and to consolidate funding for the two acts into a single block grant to states; reserving ten percent for national initiatives. Debra Miller of the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights under Law, presented the results of a study, "Sex Equity Issues in the Reauthorization of the Vocational Education Act: A Survey of State Vocational Education Directors", completed in July, 1982 (86, p. 271-303). The survey results echoed the NASDVE position statement to support sex equity in vocational education (see Appendix for major findings).

> The directors we talked with showed enthusiastic support for retaining the current federal provisions on sex equity and an understanding that a block grant approach to vocational education without federal equity requirements is synonymous with a reduced state emphasis on the needs of target groups, including the disadvantaged and women (86, p. 298).

The conclusion reached as a result of this project, was that to relax the federal emphasis and support for sex equity in vocational education just when states were beginning to support it, would be wrong.

> The slow rate of progress if anything, is the result of the permissive rather than mandatory nature of the current federal sex equity provisions (86, p. 299).

During this hearing, concern was expressed about the role of women and girls in vocational education, the failure of S. 2325 to effectively address the issue and the need to increase state incentives to provide access to vocational education for women. Janet Wells was there to speak on behalf of the NCWGE. As usual, the Administration's viewpoint was presented by Terrel H. Bell, Secretary of Education, and Robert M. Worthington, Assistant Secretary of Vocational and Adult Education. Eugene Bottoms, Executive Director of AVA, represented the traditional vocational viewpoint with support from the NASDVE and NACVE.

In February, 1983, the Oversight Hearings of Vocational Education, in the Senate, focused on the status of vocational education programs, and issues related to reauthorization of the Act. Considerable attention was given to the lack of access to programs for handicapped and disadvantaged populations at this February 23rd hearing (91), employment and training, business and educational cooperation were discussed on the 24th (91). The Executive Director of AVA, Eugene Bottoms, included several statements in his testimony about sex equity and made recommendations for a continued emphasis on equity in the broad sense (p. 120-121).

> Achieving the Equity Goals of the Legislation... First, we would recommend that sex equity provisions contained in the current legislation be retained and that sex equity be made a priority for all portions of the legislation. Current provisions have served to raise the awareness level of vocational educators across the country, and one only has to travel around the nation to find that progress is being made. We believe it is essential that a federal stimulus in this area be maintained.
>
> Second, we recommend that each state allocate a higher ratio of federal funds per capita to programs in communities it defines as 'depressed.'
>
> Further, a depressed community should be more narrowly defined than under the current act and states should be limited to defining no more than 30% of their population as living in depressed communities. This would assure that every state would have to identify those communities that are most depressed.
>
> Third, through the state plan, the states should be required to set forth goals, strategies and evaluation procedures for assisting local agencies and institutions to increase access and success through mainstream vocational education programs for those with handicapping conditions pertaining to economic background, educational achievement, physical or mental handicaps, sex stereotyping, origin and language.

Testimony by Charles S. Benson of the University of California at Berkeley, in October 1983, included the results of a study to determine the proportion of LEA's expending funds to promote sex equity in 1979-80 (94, p. 445). Three-quarters of the districts studied (554 secondary, 205 postsecondary) did not report any activities. In those districts that did undertake activities, programs were modest and half spent less than $500. Only five percent of secondary and 20% of postsecondary districts had made any changes in staffing patterns (94, p. 446). About one-fifth of the secondary and two-fifths of the postsecondary districts had organized activities to address the issue of sex discrimination. This is significant in light of the fact that the legislation clearly stated that utilizing funds for this purpose was a legitimate and proper use of federal funds.

Subsequent testimony by Larry Brown of 70001 Ltd. Youth Employment Company, concurred with the lack of progress in eliminating sex discriminatory practices in education and in the work place:

> There is little evidence that sex equity requirements of the 1976 Vocational Education Amendments have been enforced ... The Commission [National Commission for Employment Policy] found 'little movement' in state compliance with legal requirement to appoint sex equity coordinators to spell out in five-year-plans how sex bias will be overcome (94, p. 473).

Additional testimony was presented by Carole M. Johnson of the Colorado State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education (94). She stated that the "sex equity provisions have worked moderately well" (p. 482) and that the intent of Congress had begun to be realized. She felt that one "spin-off effect" of the Act was the "dramatic increase in the number of females in upper level administrative positions at both the state and local levels..." (p. 482).

Linda Tarr-Whelan, Director of Government Relations for the NEA, who had appeared at the House Hearings, reaffirmed NEA's position on sex equity.

> One aspect of the Vocational Education Act which we feel deserves special attention as you in the Congress continue your deliberations on the reauthorization of the program is the continued need to provide equity to women enrolled in the programs. Care must be taken not to track women into so-called traditional women's jobs -- which are usually low-paying and offer few opportunities for future career growth. Pay disparities between men and women doing the same jobs must also be monitored and, where present, abolished. We must also maintain sensitivity about women's special concerns as workers/students/homemakers, particularly to the increasing number of single women heads of households, who are likely to be enrolled in vocational education programs. Time and day care arrangements should be prime factors in determining and designing vocational education classes.
>
> In addition, and perhaps more importantly in terms of the legislation itself, the current provisions for women's equity should be strengthened through a stronger and more effective role for the sex equity coordinators at the state level. Staff people in these jobs should take on a more active role in developing state vocational education plans, and should be part of the state vocational education council. Moreover, provisions and a funding method to develop model sex equity programs and nontraditional job enrollment plans should be incorporated into the Vocational Education Act. The Act should also include a section aimed at coordinating all sex equity technical assistance activities as they relate to civil rights activities. Only through this enhancement of the role of the sex equity coordinator in each state can the Vocational Education Act come under adequate monitoring and enforcement to assure access and participation of women in the program (94, p. 404-405).

An assessment of vocational education opportunities for women and girls was presented on March 3, 1983 (91, p. 540-622), again by Janet Wells. She pointed out the deficiencies in the recommendations being proposed relative to eliminating sex discrimination in the Act. She recommended, on behalf of the NCWGE, that Congress strengthen the sex equity initiative by targeting more funds to meet federal goals -- that is, providing equal opportunities for all groups not adequately served by vocational education. The Coalition's complete statement on behalf of sixteen organizations was entered into the record (91, p. 581-607). This is one of the most comprehensive and enlightening documents available on the issue and provides insight on why Congress listened to the women's groups and supported their position. The final Senate bill, passed on August 8, 1984, contained 11.5% set-aside for single working parents and adult homemakers (50, p. 204).

The Act probably would not have been approved in 1984 except for the untimely death of Carl Perkins. His colleagues wanted to honor his years of work on behalf of vocational education by naming the Vocational Act for him, which they did, and it passed on October 19, 1984.

The final bill did not contain everything desired but the Coalition called it their "biggest success in Congress". The final amount set aside, 12%, amounted to approximately $85 million per year. The sex equity coordinators' budget was raised to $60,000 per year, 3.5% was authorized for sex equity, 8.5% for single parents/homemakers. The degree of success was noteworthy in light of "the Reagan Administration's full-scale assault on sex equity laws" (50, p. 105).

> It was the major victory of the decade -- the only victory of the decade. [Interviewee]

> I have a strong feeling that when somebody dusts off the writing and research [about the advocacy that we did] they'll say these people were either very foolish or very forward looking. [Interviewee]

Millsap (50) identified four factors which she feels contributed to the success of the Coalition's position with the Carl Perkins Act: (1) the strength of the Vocational Task Force members, (2) the smooth transition of leadership of the Coalition, from Janet Wells to Cindy Marano in 1984, (3) the strong support network of sex equity coordinator's, and (4) the fact that there was no unified support behind any of the bills presented (p. 198-199).

CHAPTER II

THE VIEWS OF MAJOR CONTRIBUTORS TO THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS

> With a commitment from those both inside and outside education, we will address these challenges in a way which will assure our youngsters and adults of an education based on the philosophy of equality for all. [Sex Equity Coordinator]

Interviews were conducted with a variety of individuals who had been involved personally or as a representative of a group or organization in the development, passage and/or implementation of both the 1976 Amendments and the Carl Perkins Act of 1984. Face-to-face and tape recorded interviews were used to gather data as well as telephone conversations and written correspondence.

A series of questions had been prepared in order to obtain a degree of consensus on specific issues and all face-to-face interviews were recorded on audio-tape. Subjects were also urged to expand on their experiences and share ideas and opinions on related topics.

An effort was made to contact a cross-section of individuals and groups. (See Appendix for list of participants.) Particular attention was given to those who made significant and sustained contributions to the birth and the "care and feeding" of the vocational education sex equity legislation. As is noted in the prior chapter on legislation, Washington based women's groups, key people on Capitol Hill, and sex equity coordinators all played major roles. In addition, people at the local, state and national levels were active players in the process. Many professional organizations, state agencies, federal agencies and private counseling groups were involved, each with its own unique objectives and concerns.

The majority of the people contacted were cooperative, open and anxious to contribute to the study. Many enjoyed looking back at their experiences and they provided valuable information which could not be obtained elsewhere. Although an effort was made to contact all of the key actors that could be identified, not everyone was willing to participate or responded to our many inquiries. For this reason, the facts and opinions they could have provided are missing or limited.

Those that were on the scene in Washington, DC were candid about their experiences with the legislation. Some of the people interviewed were extremely knowledgeable about the inner workings of

Congress and committee operations and many were involved from the time the issue of sex equity in vocational education was first addressed. Their insights were invaluable.

This chapter is divided into two sections. Part A is a summary of responses to selected questions posed by the author. Responses from interviewees are indented as quotations. The most interesting and informative section of the entire study is Part B, which includes the personal insights and experiences of the respondents with the legislative process. All comments are those of the respondents and every effort was made to retain their original words and intent. Minor changes were needed to maintain confidentiality and to ensure clarity when transposing from the oral to the written word.

Part A: Questions and Discussion by Respondents

1. **What were the key issues, concerns and/or events which led to the passage of the Vocational Amendments of 1976 and the Carl D. Perkins Act of 1984?**

The passage of Title IX and the Women's Movement were seen as critically important in creating an environment for change and stimulating action at the state and federal level. An important factor was timing -- the Vocational Education Act was up for reauthorization at the right time. In the early 1970's, prior to the hearings on reauthorization of the Vocational Education Act, Congress had been exposed to the problems of sex equity through discussions and hearings on Title IX, WEEA and special hearings on sex discrimination. Also, there was concern about the fact that the federal government had delayed for three years in issuing guidelines for the implementation of Title IX.

> 1974 and 1975 were critical years because it was the beginning of a great deal of advocacy activities ... especially by women's groups. Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm had held hearings on sex discrimination which laid the groundwork for the '76 Amendments. Up until this time, there had been little legislative history on sex equity issues ...

Many saw the 1976 Amendments as the beginning of social change which would have a profound impact on all aspects of society.

> It's not a women's issue, it's an everyone issue ... it's a societal thing and it's a way we need to think about things.

> Equity is a matter of social, moral and economic concern -- and we would not have that had it not been for the equity legislation.

> It is significant, of course, that vocational education was singled out, as it had been for disadvantaged and handicapped programs previously, as a vehicle for creating this kind of social change, or at least social awareness and consciousness.

> ... the period of the late 70's into the early 80's [was] a period of greater commitment to eliminating sex stereotyping in vocational education than had come before and perhaps has come since. It took the '76 Act to make people realize that it wasn't every freaky group that was pushing it [sex equity] -- it was the law of the land. It was time to realize that.

Since the time was right, the next most important factor was getting the right information to the right people on the Hill. A broad coalition of Washington based women's groups [NCWGE] had been successful in stimulating concern for women's issues and lobbying Congress for passage of prior legislation. These women became highly respected, but they were not always liked by congressional staff members with whom they worked to accomplish their goals. The Coalition targeted Vocational Education as an area that needed to be changed.

> We didn't have much support from the professional vocational organizations or vocational leaders across the nation ... and in some cases they worked against us.

> It is important to note that it was not a grass-roots movement, but rather an effort on the part of professional women to obtain equity for all women. (The reason this is important is that when the legislation was passed, there were few groups capable of organizing around it or of taking advantage of it.)

> ... gains were really made because of the women in Washington.

> It wasn't the vocational education community that lobbied and wrote the language for the '76 Amendments, it was the women's organizations.

Why did Congress listen? Statistics made the difference! Education, employment, welfare and enrollment statistics "shook the Congress". The blatant sex bias, sex stereotyping and discrimination in the classroom, in the work place, and in society in general could no longer be denied. Females were not enrolled, and in some cases were not allowed to enroll in vocational programs; females were being prepared for low-pay, dead-end jobs; most classes were segregated, and so on. When these facts were coupled with the statistics on the feminization of poverty and the impact of changing family structures, it became obvious to Congress that something must be done.

> ... it didn't take a very hard in-depth look at the vocational education establishment and traditions since 1917 to recognize how highly sex segregated and sex discriminatory vocational education, including federally funded programs, had been.

> Improved data collection techniques and requirements to collect certain kinds of data provided vital information not previously available to states and national leaders. The impact of this information cannot be overstated. Vocational education programs were segregated by sex! Also, the Adams Court Order, and subsequent Civil Rights and Title IX monitoring, showed that discrimination was still being practiced, sometimes openly and often, subtly.

Some believe that the only reason Congress became concerned about sex discrimination was because it saw how discrimination impacted the national economy. That is, issues such as unemployment, under-employment, the need for skilled workers in a service oriented economy, escalating welfare costs, and so on, were the real reasons for addressing sex bias and sex stereotyping in vocational education. There is some truth to this because if one reads the testimony presented at the various Congressional hearings on the reauthorization of the vocational education legislation, there are a great many references to work, women and families; with the emphasis on work. Employers needed female workers who weren't absent and who were productive and well trained.

In the early 80's, many people were concerned about the various inequities women were suffering. More Commissions on the Status of Women had been established, women were beginning to make progress in vocational and academic programs, and the media was bringing women's issues into the homes of American families. "Somehow it became real, not just a cause." All of these factors had an impact on the oversight and reauthorization hearings that led to the Perkins Act.

Once again, Washington based women's groups went into action.

> The Coalition's first priority was trying to get money set aside from the basic grant ... we were told by everybody that this was a total IMPOSSIBILITY. We were not deterred.

> The Vocational Education Task Force [within the Coalition] ran the show ... there were a lot of people who could care less about vocational education and we had almost complete 'carte blanche' to do whatever we wanted because nobody cared.

> The American Vocational Association thought we were just a bunch of little ladies and didn't take us seriously. We knew it ... we were trying to get the AVA to endorse our proposal ... they were never going to do that in a million years and they never did, but they didn't fight against us - that helped.

> ... the sex equity coordinators as a group were not doing anything ... basically they were not there. They were afraid they were going to lose what was in the '76 Amendments.

> The male dominated vocational education leadership at the state and local level did not take the issue seriously. The efforts needed to encourage females to consider non-traditional occupations and to enroll in corresponding vocational programs, were just not there. Sex equity coordinators had little moral and in most cases, no financial support, to try and change a life time of discriminatory attitudes and actions in public education.

It was implied by insiders that Congress reacted positively to the 1984 legislation for political reasons. Conservative congressmen who opposed the Equal Rights Amendment were concerned about losing the support of women. Thus, when the Carl Perkins Act included special funding for sex equity, homemakers and single parents; here was an opportunity to express their support for women -- and they did.

> The bills themselves [House and Senate] were so totally different, not just the sex equity part, but the bills as the whole ... we had no inkling at all that out of conference we'd get both bills. We were shocked!

> It surprised me -- every once in a while the federal government does step in and play the proper role.

2. What were the expectations for change and for enhancing opportunities for women in vocational education with the passage of the legislation, and were these changes realized?

Significantly higher enrollments of females in traditionally male vocational education programs was the expectation of the majority. Since Congress' expectations were high, since there was support from many professional and advocacy groups, and because the law was quite specific about what should happen, positive progress was expected and assumed. The rate and extent of progress was disappointing. This was not surprising since Title IX made such a slow start.

> Title IX of the Education Amendments could have been interpreted to accomplish what the '76 Amendments accomplished. But the data are very clear, almost no change occurred in most states until after 1976.

> The Title IX legislation came along prior to the sex equity provisions of the Vocational Education legislation and I think the success, if there was any success in responding to Title IX, was primarily through the sex equity coordinators in the states. We made progress but we spent the whole decade retaining Title IX.

Most realized that the climate and attitudes would not change immediately but they did not realize how controversial the issue would become. They were not aware that in many instances the total vocational system would have to be revamped, including attitudes, curriculum, language, materials and policies.

Many believed that there would be quick awareness of the need, that there would be commitment to change on the part of the vocational leadership and that most of the resistance would come from those outside the vocational community. This was not the case. The states were challenged and this challenge was met with resistance.

> I don't think a lot of them [administrators] realize what it's all about. It's not just opportunities for women, but it's opportunities for both men and women in education; it's making it better for everyone.

> There just wasn't the social pressure for this type of thing [emphasis on sex equity], and they [administrators] didn't like to be told how they were going to operate. I don't think they were necessarily afraid of it.

> The leadership in vocational education was not aware of problems relating to sex equity, nor were they prepared to implement changes.

> States would not have addressed the problem because of the pressure of many issues which discouraged initiation of major efforts in sex equity.

> We tried to move the issue of sex equity into the late 80's through advocacy with top officials in the Department of Education. I must say I have a feeling of frustration and failure as do a number of others. One high ranking governmental official, when quizzed on issues of sex equity, raised one eyebrow and said, 'I will have to study it.'

> We tried to go a little too far in terms of what was practical.
>
> We had to lower our expectations.
>
> Simply providing more programs was not the answer.

Even though the respondents "expected a lot more a lot faster", positive results were realized. There was a dramatic change in the freedom of choice provided for young people, more innovative programs were offered, and states began to work with a wide range of populations and agencies.

> I think one of the most significant outcomes was that more people beyond the equity coordinators and vocational educators became interested in looking at equal opportunity in education. Also, once schools placed women into the non-traditional vocational areas, they saw many of their vocational programs survive. Those who really worked at it saw their students get jobs and go on to earn a good living and support themselves and their children.

Much credit was given to sex equity coordinators for the progress that was made.

> I think that their commitment, their professionalism, their consistency, their tenaciousness, (and all , those words) were important factors in their effectiveness.

3. **Do you think the legislative mandates to address sex equity issues in vocational education, and to establish the sex equity coordinator's position in each state, were necessary to ensure change?**

Every person involved in this study in any way, gave an affirmative response to this question.

> The appointment of the SEC was a real focal point and perhaps was the most significant outcome of the '76 Amendments ... if it wasn't for the legislation, we would still be on the back of the bus, pregnant!
>
> Congress entered into an administrative mandate that they should not have had to do ... [but] the results have justified the mandate.
>
> The concept needed to be institutionalized. There was a need to have someone needling you and someone to keep talking about the issue to ensure change.

> Consciousness may have been raised but without the position and money, states would not have addressed the problems.

No one was able to pinpoint where, when, or by whom the idea of establishing the position of Sex Equity Coordinator was born.

> You probably can't pinpoint one person whose idea it was, it probably evolved, like with the set-aside thing -- it sort of evolved in the brainstorming sessions we had about the issues. Probably somebody said, 'Well, the Title IX Coordinators have no teeth, how do we get teeth?' And somebody else said, 'Give them money' and so on.

The reason and need for the position was not disputed.

> If you step back for a second and look at what it is that the federal government can do in any kind of educational program, and specifically in vocational education to effect some kind of social change, the mechanisms they use are really very gross. They set aside a certain amount of money for a group or purpose and tell the states they have to match the costs, or the Feds will pay for excess costs, or whatever. The Feds don't mandate the activities. These are crude ways of influencing change so you need to have somebody around who has some leverage to say what ought to be funded, especially in a system as reluctant to change as vocational education.

> My reading of it is that vocational education is a very insulated system. It is as difficult to get the people in the occupational areas to talk to each other as it is for anything/anyone outside the system to influence any particular part of it. So you not only have a very long standing system that traditionally has been isolated from everybody else but also, internally, from each other.

> The vocational education system is unlike other systems funded under Federal law. For example, under Chapter I you have state directors who identify with Chapter I. The teachers identify themselves as Chapter I teachers. Therefore, you have an alliance that is built vertically from the local to the state to the federal level. Even with all the intergovernmental stuff, vocational education people don't identify with Federal Vocational Education Offices. They would laugh you out of the room, right? The Feds don't have any sort of interpersonal influence in vocational education as they do in other programs. This makes the need for a sex equity person that much stronger.

One person said establishing the position ...

> ... was the most dynamic idea Congress has had since the Constitution.

Several respondents emphasized the fact that people are uncomfortable with change, especially "old line vocational administrators", so the position provided access to the system.

> Since the law ['76 Amendments] included the ten functions of the coordinator, there were no questions regarding his/her role and responsibilities. This was a critical factor.

The set-aside for the position was controversial from the beginning and in some states the coordinator did not have adequate access to the state director.

> The further you are away from the position of power, generally speaking, the less able you are to really control the decisions that are made. So, the problem is, if you don't have the clout within your system, it makes it really hard to implement anything.

> Once the '84 law was passed with the set-asides, a new layer of administration was added. As long as only 50,000 bucks were allocated for the position, everything was fine, but once there was money to manage, grants to approve; things changed. I tried to say this at a conference of sex equity coordinators, I tried to warn them that they needed to mobilize and be ready when the funding for set-asides became available. I tried to tell them that they would be undercut and lose their authority. They were very unhappy with me for suggesting they were politically naive. Later, I had conversations with some of them when it was happening. It was actually quite heart-breaking. It was so predictable and so much of it was avoidable if they had stopped seeing themselves as loyal bureaucrats inside their state departments and had seen themselves as advocates for an important cause.

> What has happened in my observation of sex equity coordinators is that they've become part of the state networking group and they are not only having an impact on vocational education, but they're having an impact on daycare legislation, other educational legislation and other legislation that impacts on women in a lot of other state programs.

The actions and activities of the sex equity coordinators came under some criticism also.

A small core of sex equity coordinators were very involved in the '84 process. In my view, sex equity coordinators are not a homogeneous group of people. I don't think all of them want to be involved. They may come to a leadership development conference in Washington once a year and say that they want to be involved, but if you then try to get them to follow up on things, they don't.

They [the SEC's] don't necessarily all agree with one another and that's fine unless what you're trying to do is affect public policy. Then you have to come to agreement on two or three key principles that you will try to promote. As a group, they become so focused on their own state, on their own circumstances that they wanted public policy designed to fit them personally, and who cares whether it fits the rest. There is another core group who is highly focused on the broader picture as well as what's going on in their own state. It's easy to work with that group on public policy issues because they get the big picture.

The kind of leaders needed are those who have enough ego power that they're not afraid, but care, and have devotion to the issue and the issue is the most important thing of all. I think those sex equity coordinators to whom the issue is really the driving force, are really comfortable taking a leadership role, but they [the SEC's] have not elected their strongest people to be their leaders and I think the organization suffers from that. It would be good for them to spend some time on strengthening their organization ... our organization has a broader agenda than the agenda of the sex equity coordinators, and we will always be interested in the ideas and perspectives of the sex equity coordinators but only among other things. They need to develop a way to be sure that their particular perspective is being addressed and articulated by them.

There are people out there in important leadership positions who feel women themselves and sex equity coordinators must change if progress is to be achieved. You [interviewers] need to study this kind of problem and find some answers. If you do, you are worthwhile; if you do not, all you will do is stand around and complain and that isn't of much use. I haven't seen much out of the sex equity people that yields much for women. It [what SEC's have done] is for their own position. Women have done great things and women can do them again but they have to have some kind of image that is not just based on hate. You do have to tolerate some of this stuff.

4. **What were the barriers encountered?**

There was a lot of hostility toward feminists in the early days and sex equity in vocational education was often viewed as a feminist cause. There was "a general bias by the uniformed, both males and females," and there were "many angry men and angry women".

Lack of commitment from top administrators at both the state and national level was apparent and some of the strongest opposition came from within the field of vocational education, including AVA. "The old boys network wanted to maintain the status quo". Even the USOE [in '76] was not seen as supportive, although there were individuals who worked hard to implement the law.

> States were required to have personnel to do the job but they weren't all that threatened because there really wasn't any money to do anything. The states where you had a more progressive administration and where you had a good sex equity coordinator, after the '76 Act, went ahead and did some good things. In 1984, when the Perkins Act was put in place, it was a different story because the amount of money allocated suddenly raised the ante substantially and the sex equity coordinators got more hostile responses than they had before. I think that it was because they had power and that became quite threatening to the state administrators.

It was a time when state directors were concerned about their own positions and they feared the loss of control and diversion of funds to an area in which they had little or no experience. One state director said to his newly hired sex equity coordinator:

> You'll never get another job in your life [for taking on the sex equity coordinator job].

The uncertainty of the state directors was exhibited in a variety of ways.

> After the signing of the '76 Amendments, there was apparently going to be a lengthy period of time before the rules were written and many state directors were pretty concerned about that. At a meeting, which we still called the Linthicum Meeting [Maryland], we drafted some working rules for the implementation of the '76 Amendments. I don't recall that we spent a great deal of time on the equity issue. I do recall, that the equity issue was there to be dealt with and all of us were concerned.

> At the AVA convention in '77 ... in Dallas, when Janet Wells got up to address the state directors with regard to this new law and what their agenda was, she was hissed and she was booed ... it was very embarrassing.

> Vocational program area personnel in the state offices did not feel equity was part of their job and felt that they could make better use of the set-aside funds.
>
> A lot of states were willy-nilly those first eight years before the Carl Perkins Act was funded and they even had trouble figuring out how to spend their $50,000, if you can believe that!

It was reported that verbal harassment was common, and there were people at the state level who felt that sex equity was a "no problem-problem." Even today, there are educators and administrators who believe that "this is not the way to go."

> We were a necessary evil to put up with.
>
> Coordinators have been subjected to incredible amounts of harassments, jokes, put-downs. I know people ... who didn't have as much of a sense of humor as I, who were not as willing to go along and couldn't take it.
>
> I arrived October 1, 1977, when the legislation became effective, with an empty desk, nothing on it, but the law and very little support. In fact, I didn't even have clerical staff.
>
> Basically, I was ignored. For example we had ... a [state] legislative hearing on how we needed an Affirmative Action Office -- they listened to my testimony. They said we just loved what you said and they turned around and did nothing -- zero!
>
> Most vocational equity coordinators came with backgrounds in vocational education but with very little information about sex roles. They should get a lot of credit for their courage, intelligence, integrity and persistence. They made it up as they went along, faced hostilities and hung on.
>
> I've seen people come and go in these positions [sex equity coordinator] and every time there is a change we lose ground. I think one thing that is different about the new coordinators is that their expectations are higher than ours were. They see the law, they see the traditional [programs and services], they just assume that things will be done right, and that things will change.
>
> I say to people, it's awful to hate a job you love so much ... the hell you go through in it is real difficult and it's not a job one person can do any more.

Not all sex equity coordinator were allowed to fulfill the responsibilities as outlined in the law. At times they were assigned tasks which were inappropriate or illegal.

> I am the MOA Coordinator for this state. I lie and say it only takes 25% of my time, but it really takes 50% of my time ... Everybody knows that what they are doing is illegal.
>
> Everybody knows what they are doing is illegal, but say, 'Don't worry about it', so they don't. Even the Civil Rights Office cites in its report the fact that the sex equity coordinator is also the MOA Coordinator, but there isn't a lousy sentence in there to say that this is illegal.
>
> There are a number of states that, as far as I'm concerned, are completely out of compliance with the law. They have created sex equity positions that are nothing more than paper -- the person has no authority and is not involved in decisions about funding. I believe that it's not the intent of the law to do the kind of formula funding that has occurred in some states where the money is just sent out to the locals with no strings attached. You can't even figure out what the hell happened with the money and the local institutions are not held accountable for anything. Those are the two areas where I've seen the most flagrant abuse of the Perkins Act. Most states do neither of those; they fall somewhere in between. Some states do some really good things.
>
> In the states where the Congressional intent has not been followed, the coordinators are in fact not administering the funds. I'm hoping that will be changed. If there was some enforcement from the federal level on that requirement, I think it would make a big difference.

Janet Wells, Chair of the Vocational Education Task Force of the NCWGE, had thought to file a complaint with the Education Department about states not employing sex equity coordinators on a full-time basis, but decided the political costs would be too high. Wells' response to Millsap (50) about this issues follows:

> I played around with that issue a lot, but didn't file any formal complaints, being afraid I'd create too much controversy when we were trying to get the law reauthorized and not wanting to get too many state directors [of vocational education] fighting against keeping that position. I don't know what would happen if we press that. They know we know it. I think we can make them very uncomfortable ... but it's been

> difficult to prove they've not been working full-time except through the [sex equity] coordinator herself and that would put her in a position of jeopardy and we couldn't really support her (50, p. 267).

Several personal examples of sex discrimination were presented.

> My daughter is 15. She wanted to take woodworking. She took art this year. She had to take art ... She walked into the woodworking class and there were so many cat calls that she decided not to do it. Seventeen years after that behavior was made illegal, she is still facing it.

> I did workshops as a private consultant ... At this specific workshop, I encountered a great deal of hostility, only to have an interesting thing happen at the end of the day. One individual (male) in the group, who had been most hostile, turned to another man in the audience and said, 'You know you've got to back off because you're sitting here denying what you know to be true, we discriminate. It's not just benign, we're keeping girls out of programs and you know it. So the reason you're being so mean is you know she is telling you the truth and you don't want to confront it. I know I'm wrong and I'm going to 'fess up'.' This came from somebody who for eight hours had been participating reluctantly along with everybody else. You could see that he had reached a point where he decided he was being dishonest and he just couldn't stand it. I think the people who attended that workshop did benefit. However, later my team worker received a phone call from an official in the state where the workshop was held, saying, 'We don't ever want your people in our state again!' Sometimes success is measured by strange criteria.

> I didn't go to law school until I was 28 years old. It would have happened when I was 22 if the doors had been opened earlier ... Right now we have 30 second-year law students here; half of them are women. They have no idea how different it was for those of us who came before them, even just 10 years ago.

There were few women administrators to support the cause. Some of the females in leadership positions chose not to go out on a limb and support sex equity in case they would lose credibility with their male counterparts.

There were a lot of cultural hangovers.

> It seems to me that many women have a hesitancy to become individuals or to lend the kind of support that is necessary to other women to give them the

> impetus to move ahead. These positions [sex equity coordinators] were set up for failure by design, not default and ... virtually no state has given much state money to the issue.

There were barriers among the sex equity coordinators themselves during the early days.

> I expected my colleagues would share some kind of feminist perspective about their jobs -- and that [they did not] was the biggest shock to me ... I said something like, 'as a feminist I believe', and I didn't get any further with my sentence because a number of the coordinators were very upset that I would use such a term ... their view of feminism was clearly an anti-male perspective.

Resistance at the local school district level was strong and it wasn't easy to change the system.

> The biggest problem was trying to get anything like a district commitment or a real sense of commitment that sort of permeates the schools.

> ... educators didn't think they were doing anything wrong. They saw themselves as good people, good teachers, and they would not consciously discriminate.

This made the job even harder because awareness of the need for change had to be developed.

> I believed that, and still do to an extent, if you enlighten people maybe they will make the revolution instead of ordering them about.

> I have learned to be extremely patient and plant my seeds. Three years later I will see my flowers starting to bloom. I just keep watering them slowly.

In the end, this approach did not always work and sex equity coordinators were expected, on their own, to enforce the law.

Concern was expressed about the lack of women in leadership and the need for change in the conservative teacher education community.

> I think the teacher education system is the most archaic animal that we have to deal with.

> I think it is very difficult for young women and men to see women as role models in management positions.

One person made a strong comment about vocational educators in general.

> I've really found the vocational education people to be pushy, narrow-minded and inconsiderate; as a rule. I got to the point where I said, 'I don't have to deal with this'. They [vocational people] say, 'I WANT THIS'. They don't explain why or support their cause; only that there are no alternatives. You can't just say I want that and nothing else; it doesn't work that way.
>
> I got to the point where I began to think that the country needed a new occupational education system. Is this the best there is? Is this all we have? But we have an enormous deficit [federal level] and we don't have the money to build something else. We can't afford to destroy this; we've got to make it work, we've got to make it succeed, we've got to get behind it. We have to help the people who need it.

During the reauthorization process in the early 80's, there was a conservative federal administration which influenced attitudes and actions at all governmental levels. The traditional viewpoint was expressed by several people.

> You can carry it [sex equity] too far and to me that is where we have had the problem ... we turned people off.
>
> Some women who had made it were too quick to jump on men who made slips of the tongue ... women need to be patient, supportive and helpful in order to reach our goal.

A major barrier which was not expected was the attitudes of females in the workplace. Women who needed non-traditional jobs to support themselves and their families had the most traditional attitudes. In addition, those women who entered non-traditional jobs found it difficult to get the support needed to survive in a hostile and different environment. In 1976, no funds were available for special programs and support services so those who needed the help the most were unable to participate. The Carl Perkins Act did provide funding for some of these needed services but the "supply comes no where near meeting the demand".

5. In your opinion, what were the most significant outcomes of the legislation?

National leaders looked at the outcomes from a broader perspective than local and state personnel [see the Sex Equity Coordinator's Survey]. They provided important feedback on the impact of the legislation and the resulting contributions to women, education and society in general.

The creation of the position of sex equity coordinator, providing funds to support the position, and specifying the responsibilities of the job were reported as the most significant outcomes of the legislation.

> I just think the sex equity coordinators may be the most important thing that came out of the legislation and getting people sensitive to the needs of women enrolled in non-traditional courses.

The '76 legislation laid the groundwork for focusing attention and money on a special population and its needs. It tied a problem to its consequences.

> It made people aware of the need for equal rights and it became socially acceptable to be concerned and to talk about sex equity.

> It freed us from the stereotypical thinking that women are second class citizens.

> It was the first time that Congress interfered with a purely state bureaucratic function and ... it would be an understatement to say it caused an uproar.

For those who needed or wanted access to all vocational programs, the '76 Amendments opened doors, provided choices and created training and flexible job opportunities with a future. As a result, there was an increase in the number of women enrolled in non-traditional programs, in the number being retained and becoming successful in their chosen careers.

Under the Carl Perkins Act, the impact was greatest on adult women. They flocked to the two-year colleges and moved into the mainstream -- "it changed their lives". Greater personal and social freedom for women resulted especially with the attention given to single parents and displaced homemakers.

For the first time, women's issues were tied to economic development, and as one person said,

> As long as it's [sex equity] an economic issue, it will remain a federal one.

There was greater cooperation among individuals and agencies within states. More attention was given to the need for child care and there was a greater willingness at the local level to develop programs for women.

Another significant outcome was the educating of Congressmen and Congresswomen on women's issues and vocational education.

> The equity issue may have been instrumental in saving vocational education but few in vocational education leadership positions believe that.

> Women's and advocacy groups supported vocational education as the system for providing women with education and training for work. One wonders what would have happened if they had not.

6. What do you predict will happen in the future regarding sex equity issues and concerns in vocational education? Will we see progress or setbacks?

The national leaders and supporters of sex equity legislation in vocational education are both optimistic and pessimistic and they offer some suggestions on what is needed to achieve progress in the years ahead. [This study does not include decisions by Congress on the reauthorization of the Carl Perkins Act, but does include some recommendations for changes in that legislation.]

> If they don't fiddle around a lot with the law and maintain the position of sex equity coordinator, progress can be anticipated.
>
> The last time [1984] the idea was to be revolutionary because the demographic data were so strong that Congress, the states and local agencies could not ignore the issue. This time regression is doubtful but progress may be at a slower pace.
>
> Certainly there is room for progress, need for progress, but also some hope for progress.
>
> I think we have seen about as many setbacks as we can handle.
>
> The concerns brought up in '76 have been mainstreamed. My belief is you never turn around things like this -- you just don't turn back -- if you backed away, it wouldn't look good politically. It's awfully difficult for anybody to back off from legislation supportive of women right now.
>
> We have always been ahead of ourselves ... it's now getting to the point that men realize they need all the benefits that women have been fighting for (eg., child care). So we will now start seeing ... these issues as family issues and as everyone's issues.

But have we grown accustomed to the changes? Some believe there has been some back-sliding after the initial burst of attention in the late 70's and early 80's.

> We must keep the issue in the forefront and we must encourage those involved to stay faithful to the cause if progress is to be made.

> We have won the battle but are still losing the war.
>
> I think we've slipped into a period of time, in the last four to five years, of sort of keeping pace, trying to keep up, but I don't see any sharp interventions; the debate, the sometimes almost angry, necessarily angry, approaches to get people's attention.
>
> ... Sex equity is insured when the missionary zeal that was evident in the early days, is maintained and sustained...
>
> I think we can't take an attitude of a holding action, and there's a tendency for us to do that. I think that the best way to fight is to fight with new and additional initiatives while maintaining what we've got.
>
> It isn't easy to sustain interest when things seem to be working well.

There was great support for the need to continue lobbying for continued emphasis on sex equity. The problem is some organizations that have been active in lobbying have had a difficult time staying alive during the past few years. What will happen if they disappear?

> If we lose support from the women's organizations, they're the ones who do the lobbying, we won't have anyone to lobby on our behalf.

The buzz word around Washington is "Workforce 2000" and women are two-thirds of the entrants into the workforce; therefore, many believe that there will be no problem maintaining the progress made in the provisions in the 1984 law. The shortage of workers, great numbers of single parents and the over-loaded, inadequate welfare system are critical areas needing Congressional action. These are women's issues.

> We're getting to the point in our nation where the economy could not continue, or our economic development could not continue, without the support of women in the workforce.
>
> If the reauthorization of Carl Perkins addresses vocational education as a component of economic development, then there may be a way to address the preparation of all components of our society [males and females] for their role in economic development...

There are important lessons to be learned from what happened during the development and passage of the Carl Perkins Act by all members of the vocational education community.

Congress will probably not hesitate to take a dramatic step. From what I've heard about how they changed the last legislation, I think Congress wouldn't be at all hesitant about reorganizing the whole system. Quayle [Vice President] submitted a bill that would put vocational education in the Department of Labor a couple of years ago, and he supports that position. Most people who are aware, think it should stay in the Department of Education, but there is this kind of movement afoot. When Congress looks at the workforce, when they look at unemployment, at our export/import trade balance, I think if someone came up with a good suggestion they might take it.

I'm not saying that anyone is incompetent, that is not the point. The point is that we've done great things in American education, but it's also true that the world has changed. We're now being forced to look at the world in other ways and vocational education must be a very real and vital part of that entire process.

The GAO Report found that states failed to serve the disadvantaged and handicapped and did a poor job at serving women. At a hearing, one Congressman remarked, 'What is the sense of providing access to programs that are terrible programs'.

I think Congress was making a clear statement that the federal government is not in business to fund state activities in vocational education. They're more in business to help at-risk populations participate in vocational education. That's an important distinction.

If they [Congress] do not feel that the states have responded, then it is certain that there will be a form of punishment or a form of saying 'you did not respond, therefore, we are going to make you do this' -- in the form of a mandate, or set-aside or requirement to spend certain funds on certain issues.

We're having to face a workforce now with an increasing number of immigrants and increased numbers of minorities who traditionally have not gone into the higher education fields... The educational system must serve these people also.

Following the Carl Perkins Act, people realized it [sex equity] wasn't going to go away, that equity coordinators weren't going to let it go away, and that it was really a social issue. In the beginning some people, especially administrators, felt that they did not have to worry about it. Then they began to get a little concerned because there were lawsuits and they began to realize that this is pretty serious business.

If Congress chooses to promote competitiveness by generally upgrading vocational programs, by modernizing them, by attempting better links with industry ... things some attempted to do in the Carl Perkins Act, I fear this will come at the expense of equity issues.

It does seem as though there is going to be a tremendous turnover of people pretty soon in education in general; a lot of retirements. An awful lot of people are aging out of the system and I don't know who's coming in behind them. I don't know to what extent there's going to be much movement through the ranks, women or men, who are attuned to these issues. I think that's one thing we really need to think about. Not just what sex equity coordinators are going to do, but how to get more people who are concerned into decision making positions. I think in some ways the vocational education system, such as it is, is under a tremendous amount of pressure to change, especially at the secondary level. What we need to think about are ways in which sex equity coordinators and others can take advantage of this. There is a big move, and a real hopeful one, I think, to integrate more academics with vocational education. There are a lot of questions about the value of vocational education at the secondary level and there's an increased emphasis on more academics. So I think that the sex equity folks should see if they can identify 'targets of opportunity' in the midst of all this.

I have to say that I think the most important issue in vocational education may have to do with the quality of the programs, or the goals of the programs for all students, and particularly low income students and those who may not go on to college ... whatever is necessary should be done in terms of state resources and state programming to get every student to graduate from high school by the year 2000.

Vocational education to me is an alternative way of getting a high school education. It's one way of learning and I don't think just because the ten kids who were in vocational education programs have jobs that are not directly related to what they learned in their training [is the issue].

I don't think it will [vocational education go down the tubes] and I think it is the women that will save it. Vocational education is just taking a bad, bad rap ...

> those who were opposed to equity didn't realize what strong partners we were with them in promoting vocational education -- that it was the women who said, 'This is an important system -- we have to have vocational education and we have to have it equitable because it means so much for women to be able to get training in this system'. We did more with them and more for the image of vocational education ... it was an alliance that nobody would recognize. I think that the men just never understood what we were doing for vocational education.
>
> I think it's very important for somebody out there to make the case for programs that are not stereotyped, nondiscriminatory quality programs that can contribute to competitiveness because they will be preparing all of our young people and all of our adults regardless of sex or race or creed or disadvantaged or anything else, to become contributing members of the workforce.
>
> Those people who talk about reauthorization now and are trying to bring vocational education back to what it was in 1968, will not succeed.
>
> What typically may happen out there is that there will be a subtle, but nevertheless measurable movement for control of funds ... among various segments of the vocational community. This could be disastrous.
>
> I suspect the next round will make it very clear that the full time coordinator must have autonomy and must have greater authority and discretion with regard to the funding decisions on the set-asides.
>
> Few vocational leaders accept the reality stated by one Congressman, "Why, little lady, don't they understand that half of our students are female?'
>
> Even the professional organizations are out of touch. AVA fought the set-asides in the Carl Perkins Act and evidently it [AVA] hasn't learned its lesson quite well enough yet.
>
> ... back in '83, when AVA was trying to consolidate many agencies interested in reauthorization into putting forth one bill, that bill really wanted to cut back on equity.

As in the past, the "power of numbers" may determine the future of sex equity and vocational education as a whole. It may still be difficult to document progress, but states had better realize that they must or face the "wrath of Congress". States must also remember that:

> The quality of equity is difficult to determine and there are many subtle ways of keeping women out of many programs and many jobs and that is something we truly need to understand and deal with.

The focus on upgrading the entire educational system and the "back to the basics" thrust could impact negatively on vocational education and sex equity issues.

> I see one of two things happening and I don't know which way it's going to go yet. The educational reform movement may erase the vocational element and create a future without it. If that's the case, I don't think sex equity has a great future. The Republican policymakers and advocates may decide that it is a system that is unable to be shifted or gotten rid of, so they will continue to support it. I don't know which will happen. Hopefully, within the next five years, the vocational profession will find a way to make some big moves.
>
> The perceived state of vocational programs by national leaders may affect progress on sex equity issues.

Then there are those issues that will be with us for years to come.

> I think we will see real setbacks in the future, partly because more men are saying that they are being discriminated against -- reverse discrimination. More publicity is being given to the hard time fathers are having trying to get custody. Also, we are not seeing equity issues as something worthy of publication. I believe that young people need to be active. They need to know that equity is not automatic and that they are always going to have to fight for opportunities or lose them.
>
> You [I] go out and do workshops and speak to student bodies with many young women. You ask how many believe work will be a significant part of their lives, and you get silence! Then you ask how many of their mothers work and there is a mass uprising. They still believe somebody's going to take care of them...
>
> Sexual harassment still exists and we can deal with it a little better, but we're getting to the point where students are saying, 'You'd better deal with it or else we're going to force you to deal with it'. The laws have helped with sex discrimination complaints, but I notice whenever someone is fighting that issue, it's usually a no-win situation. The quality of sex equity and any equity is very difficult to measure. Attitudes and behaviors have not been assessed. People can say a lot of things, and turn right around and do just the opposite.

> There are people who believe that there is something wrong with our sexuality if we enter a trade or industrial type occupation. A lot of work has been done and still needs to be done to remove the barriers to non-traditional vocational enrollment. I'm still amazed when I walk into some of the trade programs at the college where I work; like welding and automotives, and find, every once in a while, a female. One time I found two [females] and almost fainted.
>
> Women and minorities still have stricter guidelines to follow and if they do not follow them, they are not tolerated. Men are still protected by their male counterparts, no matter how ineffective they are. We cannot support these attitudes, behaviors and customs, and we must say so!
>
> One reads the Chronicle of Higher Education or Education Week and never sees sex equity mentioned. When one reads the various journals and newsletters of the American Vocational Association, one occasionally sees a name from the past reincarnated in some new role. Perhaps the death knell for the sex equity movement was brought about all too early by the demise of the National Center at Ohio State. Or perhaps we did our job too well. I do not know. But I feel strongly that my daughter and her generation, as they move into teaching, can do so with less hassle and certainly with more freedom of action than we could.
>
> The last ten years have not brought expanding choices, but diminishing chances. There is a dual labor market in the United States which continues to disadvantage women. The primary sector is characterized by high wages, fringe benefits, job security, advancement and due process. But most women work in the secondary labor market, whose characteristics are low wages, few benefits, low job security, and career ladders with no rungs.
>
> I think passage of the ERA will help, I think it is just a matter of when it happens. We should also see continued progress because both men and women are in leadership roles, and with women in leadership roles we will have their continued voice and presence which will make an impact.

One researcher who completed studies on the implementation of the legislation expressed concern for the lack of progress and the seriousness of the situation.

> It was really disappointing to me when I went around and talked to people. They all know the words sex equity, but they think that 'we've taken care of that'

> because one female was enrolled in auto mechanics, or two in something else. There's this notion that if you've done it once, that's all that's needed. 'We had one last year, but you know, they just don't want to do this kind of thing.'
>
> It's not that they're trying to get out of something -- they genuinely believe that they have fixed it. For example, we would ask them why there are so many girls enrolled in cosmetology, if they had ever discussed the economic consequences or what the labor market is like for cosmetologists. The response was, 'Oh, well, they really like to go in and out of the workplace, and they want to be able to give perms in their homes and stuff like that'. These people are not particularly thoughtless or callous or mean-spirited. They just don't see what's wrong. It's as though educating them has to be done on a program by program, institution by institution basis; almost individual by individual. It's scary.

Concern was expressed for the fact that those who worked so hard to change attitudes and behaviors are aging, but there is hope that the new attitudes will become the standards.

> I guess the thing that I find personally and professionally is that women have grown and they want to be achievers and they want options and they do not want to be relegated to certain roles in life.
>
> ... But most important, we've had a central shift in public opinion in the last ten years. The vast majority of the American public now absolutely accepts the need to educate girls and women for self sufficiency.

One person said it all with the following statement:

> The most significant outcome of both pieces of legislation is that they are still on the books ...

There were many more negative than positive comments regarding the future, but there was an underlying feeling of hope.

> I don't think any large culture has tried so consistently to change roles of men and women and I don't think we should lose sight of the fact that extraordinary change has happened.
>
> The federal role and responsibilities for eliminating sex discrimination were identified and strengthened.
>
> ... establishing that office of sex equity in the [U.S.] Department of Education was really crucial. For the first time the responsibility and mission were clear -- that equity was expected in all classrooms. Young boys as well as girls needed to learn that they had brains regardless of their gender ...

> I think it was the first time the place [Federal government] not only recognized, but actually institutionalized it [sex equity].
>
> We certainly, as women, enjoy greater personal and social freedom. We can get loans, buy houses, and do some kinds of things that were not done before, and we're slowly building and using political power. That's probably more obvious to people like yourself who are working with women in higher education. We're learning new skills and we are working in non-traditional occupations. More women are taking math, science, and engineering classes to work toward technology careers. Half of the students in our current engineering-type classes are women and minorities and we probably have never had such an opportunity to contribute to our country. Now you see many women working on political concerns related to women who are at risk for one reason or another; such as the elderly, handicapped, single parents, migrant workers, or whatever. However, discrimination, bias, and stereotyping still exist.
>
> I do feel that the emphasis that has been put on sex equity and the people who have been behind the movement over the years, beginning with the '76 Amendments, have brought about great changes in our country. We're getting to the point in our nation where the economy could not continue, or our economic development could not continue, without the support of women in the work force. In time, the "demographics of available people will eliminate the issue of sex equity".

Part B: Personal Views and Observations

Legislative Issues

People see events from their own perspective and usually no two people see an event in the same way -- that is why the following commentaries are so interesting and colorful. There is repetition and difference in opinion; but these views from the "insiders" cannot be found elsewhere in the literature. After 10-14 years, it is difficult for anyone to remember the specific details of an event; therefore, the unintentional mistakes and omissions by participants are excused -- as we hope participants will forgive the unintentional errors of the translators. The following comments are presented in a narrative format to facilitate readibility.

● ● ● ●

Many of the equity problems in this country have been addressed at the federal/national level whether you're talking about legislation or Supreme Court decisions. First, it was in the area of racial discrimination in the 60's and early 70's. I don't think these provisions [sex equity] would have been put in the Vocational Education Act without first having Title IX which was passed in '72. It took a lot of activity over a three year period to develop the Title IX regulations and get them issued by the Federal government.

During that time much thought was given to the various ways women were being discriminated against. Of course, vocational education was one of the most discriminatory. I mean schools closed courses to women, officially! I believed some affirmative steps were necessary to encourage action that was sensitive to women's needs in vocational education so that there would be a substantial change in enrollment patterns. The states wouldn't have done it on their own. I think state education agencies, at that point, didn't see their role as being aggressive on equity issues. Actually nobody saw their role as being aggressive, but they weren't alone. Very few women saw the issues before 1970. States have changed a great deal and they do see that they have responsibilities in that area.

Ellen Hoffman worked for Senator Mondale and had a lot to do with the origins of the Women's Educational Equity Act. Vocational education was up for reauthorization and Senator Mondale had an amendment that he was pushing that dealt with sex equity. As I remember, some sex equity provisions were introduced on the Senate side and Ellen worked with the vocational legislation. That may be where the idea of the sex equity coordinator was first proposed. I can't remember. The problem was on the House side; very little had been done. Perkins was Chair of the Committee and Shirley Downs was working with Representative Shirley Chisholm, who was on the Education and Labor Committee at that time. Jack Jennings was a top staff person and was very helpful in all of this.

One of the key actors in promoting sex equity in vocational education was Janet Wells. Some people in Washington referred to her as "Ms. Vocational Education." She was extremely knowledgeable about vocational education legislation and was highly respected by others concerned about and involved in equity issues.

While working for the American Friends Service Committee, she designed the first project that looked at Title IX enforcement. The project involved six southern states working with volunteers, like the League of Women Voters, AAUW chapters and other groups, to monitor Title IX. What they found was, as one school official said, 'We're going to implement it [Title IX] on the last hour of the last day that we have to.' Another one said, 'We'll implement it when people find out about it.' Essentially, they found out that the law wasn't being implemented at all that first year.

A lot didn't happen that we expected with Title IX. I know that data showed a big jump, right after Title IX was implemented, of girls going into vocational education programs, but it just kind of held there. School systems were still telling any girl who was interested in non-traditional vocational education, 'Oh, you don't really want to do this, it's dirty work'. We heard that repeatedly. It was obvious that just taking down a legal barrier wasn't going to do the job. Women and girls, boys and men had been tracked for centuries and weren't going to look for non-traditional opportunities overnight.

I've seen a lot of progress. I'm very proud of my role in the 1976 Vocational Education Act. I felt very strongly that more than just a sex equity coordinator position was needed. We were the ones who drafted much of the language about planning. It's throughout the bill.

I think the provisions for women should be, and have been expanded, but we need to work on opportunities for minorities and other disadvantaged groups. I really think the '76 Act was a model piece of legislation and I get very sensitive when it's attacked. I've watched progress in school desegregation and I'm seeing a lot of opportunities opened to women and minorities; but, you know, there are still many problems. I have tremendous respect for what's been done with the set-aside money for displaced homemakers. I think some of the most creative programs funded through vocational education are those programs.

At that time [early '70's], people saw vocational education as a very viable way of training and educating both women and men. At the time, I really thought that vocational education was an important thing but have greater doubts about that today.

• • • •

In 1975, Bill Pierce, as the Deputy Commissioner [of BOAE] made a decision to bring in a special assistant to begin to advise him on women's issues. There was a considerable amount of mail and a considerable number of inquiries about what the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education was doing with regards to the role of women in vocational education. He brought in Deborah Ashford, from the University of Alabama, and Deborah began to handle communications and inquiries and hold meetings with various groups in Washington. We spent a great deal of time together working on common issues. That was my introduction to sex equity.

In 1975, the reauthorization of the '68 Vocational Education Amendments was in full swing. Every group out there, including the National Advisory Council [NACVE], came up with their own reauthorization bill. Knowing that there was going to be a lot of attention on the Vocational Education Amendments, particularly in light of all the work that Shirley Chisholm had done, I became very interested in what this legislation was going to be. The Vocational Education Act of '63 was amended in '68 and it was still very much an education bill. Its focus was on technical education in the truest sense of the word -- to provide skilled training. The '63 Amendments had no requirements dealing with at-risk populations and it was only in '68 that Congress had put in two set-asides for the handicapped and disadvantaged with no required match.

Title IX was already six years old [in 1978]. This legislation required them to promulgate the regulations which the President would eventually sign. A lot of activity was taking place with regard to Women's Advocacy Groups, plus there was very little legislative history so the door was wide open to really set out the Title IX regulations in a totally new and creative way.

What's particularly interesting is that in '74 and '75, the General Accounting Office undertook a major study of the vocational education enterprise in the United States. They looked at six or seven states and produced a report (19). In fact, I remember it pretty vividly because the day that report was released, it hit the front page of the Washington Star GAO blasted vocational education. The thrust of the GAO report was that the states failed to use any of their own monies to serve the handicapped and disadvantaged and did a miserable job with regard to serving women. Furthermore, it stated that women were placed in traditional jobs and stereotyping was commonplace. Congress had asked GAO to undertake this study, so there was a lot brewing with regard to vocational education.

We knew the '76 Amendments were going to deal with significant change. It was no longer a purely educational bill; people called it a Civil Rights Bill or a piece of social legislation. It contained at least 25 provisions dealing with sex equity. One of the major thrusts was, of course, the creation of the office of a full time sex equity coordinator. Not only was it the first education bill ever to create an office such as that, but what was particularly surprising, was the length that Congress went to to interfere with a purely state bureaucratic function [author's emphasis].

When the legislation first hit, there was a cry among many State Attorneys General, that it was a flagrant abuse of Federal power to dictate to state bureaucracies on how they should structure themselves to carry out a mandate such as this. States did not want to be told that they had to hire, and even though the Feds were paying 100 percent [of the salary], a full time person to carry out this activity. They [Congress] dictated this requirement to all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. Then diversity became an issue. 'Can a job such as this be handled by one person in New York', and 'Do you need one person in Wyoming or Nevada working full time to carry out this job?' In '76, many of the state directors in rural states were not even spending 100 percent of their time on vocational education. Also, during the first several months there was a great deal of confusion and resistance to state bureaucracies having to conform to this federal regulation.

At this time, President Ford tried to introduce greater public involvement in rulemaking. So Bill Pierce, as Deputy Commissioner, wanted to take a different approach to rulemaking under this vocational education legislation. He appointed a task force within the Office of Education to draft the regulations. Previously, groups or committees within the Office of Education who drafted regulations were frequently made up of mid-level managers and bureaucrats. Pierce decided to take a different approach. He appointed the highest grade people within the office to develop the regulations. This included such people as Dick Carlson, the Director of the Office of Vocational Education and Sheryl McMillan, (one of those super great people). He appointed Julie [Juliette] Lester to be the head of the task force. He requested that both myself and my supervisor work as much as possible on the task.

We introduced an approach to these regulations which tried to involve the public as much as possible. We even went out with hearings before the public before the proposed rules were written to get more input on the issues of equity. My role was to meet with as many people as I could to get input on how the regulations should be written. We spent a year writing the proposed regulations and final regulations to implement the legislation. The states really began to come around and realize that if they were going to participate with vocational education, if they were going to receive their grants, they had to name a full time person to carry out sex equity activities. Also, they had to certify [in their state plan] that this person would work full time.

Some states were slow coming aboard. They went about picking sex equity coordinators and most selected individuals from within the bureaucracy. Many states selected people who had a background in the area of home economics. I think that was a statement of where many state directors were coming from, 'We'll just put someone from home economics in this role and not worry about it.'

Requests for legal opinions started coming in rapidly from the field to deal with the legislation. What does full time mean? What specifically was the role of the coordinator in regard to approval of grants? What input were they [SEC's] to give to grant making within the state.

One of the critical events, which I'm sure is in your research and you're going to hear a great deal about, was the meeting at Coolfant. What happened was that Deborah Ashford left the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education shortly after the enactment of the legislation and went to the Office for Civil Rights. She was replaced by Sheryl Dembo. At that time, the position [Special Assistant on Women's Issues] had become established within the Division of Vocational Education. Sheryl informed me that a workshop was going to be held in Berkeley Springs, West Virginia, at a place called Coolfant, and she would appreciate if I would go and talk to the group. This would be the first meeting for state coordinators. (I should indicate here that I did go to the AVA Convention in

Atlantic City which was held in December, 1977. At that time, Charlie Buzzell was the Acting Deputy Commissioner and I remember quite well that we sat up there on the dais and the questions started coming fast and furiously. We were responding as fast as we could and stating that the regulations hadn't even been written yet. About 12-15 coordinators were at Atlantic City and I think what happened there set the stage for VEEC and what VEEC was to become. Also, I remember meeting Mary Ellis at that time and she was moving full steam ahead with her consulting firm.) [Back to Coolfant.] I tried to respond to as many questions as I could. I wanted to help these people because all of a sudden they were put into decision-making roles, they had considerable administrative authority and they had no training whatsoever for the job.

I thoroughly enjoyed that experience. I chuckle in a way because I was trying to look into the future as to what would happen and nobody could really predict the outcome. On the other hand, some of the males, who were also at Coolfant, were having the grandest time. They were surrounded by 50 women; few men were there. They felt on top of the world. I don't know if there was full recognition on their part as to what the stakes really were. Here were many of the future leaders in the [sex] equity movement and they had to be taken seriously. I can almost say with conviction that there was not that degree of seriousness among many of the male establishment in the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education at the time. I think that they learned in short order that they had to take this whole thing seriously.

I think that if you were to ask people at the Bureau in '76 whether the Amendments constituted social legislation they would say, 'No, it's a typical education bill.' But it wasn't. It was landmark legislation because Congress was saying, we are going to use an education authorization vehicle to put in place all of the Civil Rights provisions [authors emphasis]. The statute is filled with affirmative action provisions, and the people in the Civil Rights field recognized the Amendments as a Civil Rights Bill.

• • • •

It wasn't happening [elimination of sex discrimination] in the workplace, it wasn't happening in the marketplace and it wasn't happening in the home. Also, Congress recognized that it had little control over unions and labor, but if they [moved] to the education sector over which they had more control, they might be able to break down some barriers.

• • • •

I recall being part of a large group that met with Fritz Mondale and his office staff to discuss the need for strategies to be sure that sex equity was adequately included in the then pending reauthorization of the vocational education legislation. I believe it was Ellen Hoffman who was then on Mondale's staff who pulled the group together and worked with us most actively. We [National Advisory Council for Women's Educational Programs (NACWEP)] supported vocational education and other feminist legislative agendas. We testified on various bills and shared information with the staff and local Commissions [on the Status of Women] around the country.

Initial efforts of the Advisory Council focused on the provisions of the legislation. We analyzed the Senate and House bills and disseminated our materials to a lot of the national organizations, coalitions and others. We were pleased with a great many of the provisions in the law. Then the Council met with the Office of Education Task Force that was responsible for the new regulations and we gave formal input when the Notice of Intent to Publish was in the Federal Register. We did a great deal of analysis at the different stages of the regulations and disseminated information widely. I believe that our input into those regulations and the contributions we made to other women's organizations were the really significant things that we did in our early years. Unlike a great many of the women's organizations, including those that were part of the Coalition, we had full time comparatively well paid staff that was able to focus on issues and then share our analyses, thoughts and recommendations with largely volunteer organizations. I think that they used our material quite effectively. They could do the lobbying which we couldn't and it made for a very good combination of forces.

When the regulations were finally issued in late '77, there were 69 pages of technical language. We decided to do a special project and summarize the provisions which related directly to sex bias and sex stereotyping. We sent this summary, which consisted of six pages in plain english, to state divisions of vocational education, state sex equity coordinators, and to the public in general. Hundreds of requests for the summary poured into the Council office. I believe that we really made a significant contribution to awareness and utilization of the sex equity provisions by doing that.

In late '77, we joined forces with our parallel council, The National Advisory Council on Vocational Education, and formed a joint Task Force on Sex Equity and Vocational Education. I think it's fair to say that without our nudging and pushing them into this joint project, the Advisory Council on Vocational Education would not have turned its attention to the sex equity provisions. The Task Force met with the sex equity coordinators. We developed some charts on available state and local resources and other useful materials were distributed. Also, we analyzed several of the state vocational education five-year plans and informed the Commissioner of Education about places where these plans fell short of compliance in the sex equity area.

With the Advisory Council on Vocational Education, NACWEP undertook a major study of sex equity. First, we compiled data from a number of other studies and projects and then we developed a series of regional hearings and public forums on the impact of the sex equity provisions. Roslyn Kane of the Institute of Women's Concerns in Arlington, Virginia, was the contractor for the project. The final report, Increasing Sex Equity, The Impact of the '76 Sex Equity Amendments on Sex Equity in Vocational Education, dated December, 1980, was published by the two advisory councils. (54)

The purpose of the hearings and the report was to enable the two councils to decide on what advice they would give to Congress and the Secretary of Education regarding the reauthorization of the Vocational Education Act. We shared the report widely and we sponsored two forums for organizations in order to stimulate their interest in sex equity. A lot of proposals were generated and we finally developed our own recommendations. We were invited to testify at the House hearings. Our Vice-Chair and a representative of the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education testified jointly, based on what had been put into that report.

I regret to say that was pretty much our last hurrah in this field because in the Spring of 1982, the Reagan Administration appointed a full slate of new members [NACWEP]. When they were finally confirmed and met in early July, their first action was to fire me as Executive Director and hire a new director, who had been Phyllis Schlafly's right hand woman in Illinois. It took them a long time to become informed and organized ... they have not accomplished very much. How much interest they have, if any, in vocational education and what they've done since then, I really wouldn't know.

• • • •

In the early '70's, there was considerably activity at the State and local level to use more of the federal vocational education funds for post-secondary education. Those who worked in state government and directed local programs are well aware of the problems, jealousies and divisions that resulted from these activities, plus the resulting political pressures. However, few people were concerned about equity issues. They just wanted the money. There is no doubt that as time passed, all leaders at the post-secondary level realized that increasing the female population in their institutions was important from a variety of perspectives; financially, politically, socially and personally.

Prior to the '76 Act, the AACJC had not really focused on the vocational side of two-year colleges. As a result of the sex equity movement of 1976, it took on a role it had never had before. We [AACJC] assumed a seat on the board of the National Center for Research in Vocational Education. We also assumed a role in the leadership of the National Vocational Education Advisory Council. We found ourselves in something of a competitive mode with the American Vocational Association. Those were tough days. We fought over the issues that AVA needed to address, and we urged AVA to move over and make a little more room for two-year colleges.

Sometimes the programs that we backed were trivial but significant. For example, one community college created a ceremony to open a new toilet (I cut the ribbon). From that day forward there was no reason why women should be excluded from registering for automotive aviation repair, or diesel mechanics. It was a major victory for the moment. We won on another front. Take the case of a community college president who said, 'I don't have either the will nor the way to hire an Affirmative Action Officer.' After a threatened lawsuit; he appointed one. Within two years, the resulting furor died down and he retired.

Over the summer months of 1976, the Executive Director of the Women's Educational Equity Act Advisory Committee, set the tone for a number of us who were lobbying in Washington. She provided money ($9,999 as I recall) to conduct five hearings around the country for displaced homemakers. We interviewed more than 2,000 women and they in turn prepared testimony; writing of their battles to attain personal and career goals. One of the hearings that stands out in mind was in Houston, Texas, the day the International Women's Year Conference opened. Phyllis Schlafly threatened to picket or otherwise disrupt our hearing, but we prevailed. The Houston Community College provided us with guards and we were given strong emotional support by the NACWEP staff.

During the summer of 1980, we worked with Matilda Butler of Far West Labs, and Louise Vetter of the National Center, to provide examples of sex equity vocational education activities that could be replicated readily and at low cost. Perhaps the most rewarding feeling was when we were joined by a group of valiant older men in our quest for equity.

We found that the '76 Amendments were barely moving into the centerfold before it came time to renew and revitalize with the Carl Perkins Act of 1984. In my opinion, the most significant outcome of the '76 Amendments was the turning point that it gave to women. Without the '76 Amendments to boost the funding of the movement of women into better paying roles, without equiping the colleges, and certainly without the sex equity elements of the Vocational Amendments, we would never have had the drive to make the Carl Perkins Act of 1984 come alive.

There were women around the country who had the courage to stand up for what they believed; sex equity coordinators, who took their jobs seriously, were able to mandate change. I think of the valiant women who pursued sex equity; people like Cindy Marano; Lucy Thrane at the National Center for Research in Vocational Education, and her colleagues who kept prodding, pushing and cajoling the leadership to move ahead -- to pay attention that the 'Good Old Girl's Network' had arrived! During the year that we worked with the National Center, we designed and developed a number of instruments for use in both vocational schools and community colleges. We're forever grateful to Lucy Thrane, Louise Vetter and other researchers at the Center.

Where are we today? AACJC now accepts the American Association of Women in Community and Junior Colleges as a full fledged association -- it has a direct affiliation with the parent organization, and it bids for, and successfully places on the parent organization's board, a woman for a three-year term. There have been six or eight including one who rose to being president of AACJC. Women are now in the mainstream, but some of our younger sisters do not understand the courage we had to step forward in the early days and make a difference.

• • • •

Some members of the House Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education called upon Chairman Perkins to hold a series of hearings on Sex Discrimination and Sex Stereotyping in Vocational Education. These hearings were held in 1975. What resulted was that a great amount of information on the problem [of women, work and discrimination] was published in one document for the first time. This statistical information showed the patterns of sex stereotyping and how little had changed since the early '60's. That hearing document was one of the most popular ones that the Subcommittee ever published. The Committee continued to get requests for the publication eight to ten years after the hearings. The document itself became a bit of a collector's item.

Some of the women's organizations around town, even before the hearings, helped to spur the interests of the organizations to make the vocational education legislation a priority for the next go-around. At that time, Congresswoman Mink was still on the Subcommittee. She was one of the women members who became interested in the issue. Some of the other members, such as Congressman George Miller, had a keen interest also. The expectations for change in '76 were high in that the climate was right to try to do something. The groups that one might expect to oppose this sort of thing didn't; that's not to say there wasn't opposition but most of the strongest opposition came from within the field of vocational education itself.

• • • •

In 1976, various organizations were beginning to awaken and be more involved in the passage of vocational education legislation. At that time, the primary players were the AVA and all its affiliates, such as the state directors, the state vocational associations, student organizations, state councils -- all the vocational education family members were primary players in vocational education legislation in '76. Other education organizations wanted to be major players at that time; such as the National Education Association, American Federation of Teachers, the Chief State School Officers, and local boards of education. However, they had not fully understood the issues and the processes in '76. While they made bold moves, and in some instances threats, that they were going to displace the vocational community in vocational legislation, that did not occur and the vocational community generally prevailed over the educational community on legislative issues.

There were other groups such as the National Alliance of Business, Governors Association and the Council of State Legislators who had a narrowly defined interest in vocational education; interests that were not fully developed. Even though they carried the issues of private sector involvement, or other such related issues, they were not major factors in forming the total legislation. They did make inroads on certain issues that would carry over into 1984. [author's emphasis]

• • • •

During this period, important contributions were made by a variety of people. Cindy Brown who later became a deputy at the Office for Civil Rights; Margaret Dunkle who later became a member of the legislative education staff in the Carter administration on legislation; and Carol Burrows who was one of the best lobbyists we had on women's issues. Carol was one of the key people in the women's movement who tied women's issues to economic empowerment. Many women in the women's movement came from privileged backgrounds. Many of the feminists had a college education and focused on issues like Title IX, getting into college, and equal opportunity and employment opportunities for women who had a fair amount of education. Carol tended to focus on women at the bottom and tied these issues to economic deprivation.

One of the people who had been involved and who was very helpful to us at that time was Corrine Rieder, who was at NIE. She was one of the key people in terms of getting the message across about the problems we encountered with girls in secondary education, which I refer to as a 'pom-pom queen mentality'. Arvonne Fraser of WEAL was also important. She was the wife of Congressman Don Fraser, and she was an active feminist ... She raised many of the same issues, but in an educational context, and was active with Title IX. There was a high crossover of people who were involved in this issue [Title IX] and subsequently became involved in other related issues. Ellen Sudo was at the Academic Study Group and did legislative summaries on issues that were coming before the Congress. She was a committed feminist and made sure that any piece of legislation that had implications for women, of whatever nature, was fully explained and supported with excellent background information. Also, she was important in terms of helping to prepare the floor for activities. I might add, and this is very important, it was not only the women lobbyists but those who were sensitive to the issues, such as: Jack Jennings, Chief Counsel to Carl Perkins who made the difference... It was he who went to Mr. Perkins and saw to it that Shirley Chisholm chaired this set of hearings and that they were her responsibility [author's emphasis].

Charlie Radcliffe, precisely because he wasn't a feminist, was wonderfully effective. He became educated on the issues, thus the issues became very acceptable to other people; such as other conservatives, Republicans, and traditional men. He was wonderful on all of this. If there's a lesson to be learned, it is that you can always persuade people, if they understand the substance, wherever they come from in the political spectrum and whatever their background. Often your very best allies are people who are conservative or who are members of an unlikely coalition. That's a lesson that I learned very early from Shirley Chisholm. It's a kind of legislative coalition building. But we really owe a real debt of gratitude to those members [of Congress] and their staff who took these lessons to heart.

The interesting thing that came out of this was George Miller's deep involvement with all sorts of women's issues. Subsequently, he became one of the leaders in feeding programs, nutrition programs, daycare issues as well as other women's issues. It was also the beginning of Education and Labor Committee members increased sophistication about female headed households and the interrelationship between these problems and welfare dependency. People like then ranking Republican Al Quie became very, very interested in this issue; also Representative Bowen. Remember that Representative Bowen was ill when we were involved with final passage on the floor and he came in to vote even though he was ill. Later he became involved with a number of other initiatives and did some work on the Equal Rights Amendment.

On the Senate side, I think Stafford was very supportive as was Kennedy's staff. Lowell Weicker was the only Republican on our side. I remember the oversight Hearing on Sex Equity when we discussed what was happening in sex equity and a Congressman said we were trying to destroy motherhood and apple pie.

There were a lot of spin-offs. Members became interested in not just vocational education/sex equity issues, but women's issues across the board; whether they were in education, training or the broader economic welfare legislation. That is, in my judgement, the greatest legacy of this set of hearings [author's emphasis]. Another contribution of the sex equity hearings was laying the groundwork for the Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984.

• • • •

I believe that the sex equity hearings laid the groundwork for targeting and focusing on individual populations which later became one of the hallmarks of the 1984 Amendments. A lot of correlative data was prepared that had implications not only for women but the tracking that took place had implications for hispanics and blacks in particular.

We did not have a fight on establishing the position of the sex equity coordinator; there wasn't any show of contention. The position was promoted by the Coalition. They saw it as necessary to have an advocate on-site to raise issues and to carry our consciousness-raising activities at the state level. Also, the Coalition was very involved in developing background information for members on any of the specific substantive language included in the Amendments.

I genuinely think that the sex equity hearings and the passage of the sex equity provisions of the Vocational Amendments of 1976 were really 'watershed amendments' because they helped to crystallize the thinking of a lot of members of Congress about sex equity issues in the broadest sense. It made them [Congress] advocates on these issues not only in this forum but in other areas and with other pieces of legislation.

• • • •

In 1984, the education community had matured in its understanding of vocational legislation and issues driving Congress, so the educational organizations became even more viable legislative advocates for vocational education leading up to the Carl Perkins Act; especially the local school boards who were adamant in their pursuit. The Local School Boards Association, National Education Association, and one or two other smaller groups formed coalitions to address specific issues, especially that of governance. They wanted control, or governance, to be placed at the local level so that state officers would have no administrative control or policy control over vocational education. This was a strong movement in '84, and a movement that couldn't be ignored at that time, and cannot be ignored in the future.

It appeared that in the 70's and early 80's with the great influx of women into the workforce, it was obvious that there was a differential in salary and treatment in employment. This related to the differences in training [of women] and how they were prepared for work. Primarily then, Congress turned to education agencies and institutions to address the inequities and to charge them with the responsibility of moving a significant portion of the American workforce into the mainstream.

Congress, as well as the advocacy groups, expected change to occur not only in the educational setting, but in the work place. The educational setting was expected to change so that they would provide greater outreach for women ... actively, not passively. In the work place, Congress was looking for increased equitable treatment of women. We know that changes were being made in the work place; women were slowly being given the opportunities that were not there even in the early 70's, and definitely not in the 60's. Yet, while there were some changes, it is noted that these changes were not fully matured at this point in time.

• • • •

The staff of the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education followed the implementation of the '76 law, held oversight hearings on its progress, talked to people in the field, got reports from lobbyists and read major evaluation studies. While there was some movement to reduce sex stereotyping, the facts showed years later that there was a very small percentage of change in classroom enrollment figures.

The Subcommittee also held a hearing on the progress that had occurred since the '76 Amendments in regard to sex equity. The bottom line being that progress had been made but it certainly wasn't enough. The field was still heavily sex stereotyped; opportunities still seemed to be limited for women and administrators and states were spending a very small percentage of their money on sex equity issues. Therefore, members of the House Committee began to agree with some of the women's organizations, that it would be necessary to mandate a percentage set-aside to be spent for sex equity activities. However, Chairman of the Committee, Carl Perkins, was concerned and felt that it wouldn't do much good if Federal funding was spread all over the place or if states resent the Federal presence so much that they no longer would participate in the Federal program. Mr. Perkins had a strong feeling that the resentment of Federal intrusiveness was what contributed to the Reagan landslide in 1980. This impacted on his chances of getting a lot of his education bills through the House in the early 80's. Thus, the Subcommittee had to be careful about the type of legislation it proposed in '84 when the Reagan Administration was riding high and still controlled a significant number of votes in Congress.

The Vocational Education legislation had to be popular enough to get through the House; yet at the same time, there was a realization that the promise of the '76 Amendments had not been achieved. There was support within the Education and Labor Committee, which was one of the most liberal committees of the House, to do something. The interesting thing was they wanted to do more, not only for sex equity but also for handicapped and disadvantaged populations, generally through the set-aside approach. In order for everyone to be satisfied, all the money in the law would have had to have been set aside leaving nothing for general program operations. This would have caused an enormous distaste for the legislation in the field and could have resulted in states choosing not to participate in the program at all, or in overturning the law on the House floor, or overturning the Committee's bill on the House floor ... these were the risks when trying to strike a balance in '84. Then came one more complication.

The very strong Chairman of the Committee, Congressman Perkins died in August of '84, after the House had passed the bill, but before the process was completed. Congressman Augustus Hawkins, very capably assumed Chairmanship of the Committee, but he had not been as heavily involved in drafting the legislation. He was a new Chairman, he had yet to get the feel of where his power lay within the Committee, and he had yet to negotiate with the Senate on a major education bill as Chairman of the House-Senate Conference Committee. This made the development of the '84 amendment more complicated.

The Senate had come in with a bill that had very high percentages of funding for set-asides. They had included some set-asides that weren't in the House bill. The set-asides from both House and Senate would have equaled about 65-70 percent of the money in the bill leaving no money for general program improvement at a time when it was clear people were questioning whether vocational education programs were up-to-date, or whether it could meet the economic demands of the future. Eventually, the bill came out of the Conference and included set-aside funds for sex equity activities as well as for single parent and homemaker training programs. The total percentage that would be used for activities to improve opportunities for women and girls in particular, and to improve the sex equity for both sexes, was greatly increased.

• • • •

When it came to the '84 Act, Carl Perkins, who was the Chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee, was still the most significant person involved in the development of the '84 legislation. Congressman Bill Goodling of Pennsylvania was close to Congressman Perkins. We met with Perkins most everyday to discuss the legislation and Goodling was part of that discussion. Throughout the final negotiations of the legislation and prior to his death, Carl Perkins kept control of the legislative agenda and always actively involved Goodling. They were the major players on the House side prior to Carl Perkins' death. After, Bill Ford was asked to and did assume a major role in negotiating the legislation for the Committee and carried through on several issues for vocational education after the death of Perkins.

Senator Stafford, who was the leading member of the Subcommittee in the Senate, his staff and Senator Pell, who was the minority member of the Senate Subcommittee, played major roles in shaping the Federal legislation for vocational education.

While the professionals, represented by AVA, worked closely with the House to introduce and develop the bill; the Senate, represented by Senator Pell and staff, and Stafford and his staff; developed their own versions of the legislation. It was appropriate [then] for them to sit with the education community; specifically with the vocational community or the AVA staff to negotiate the differences.

Also it has to be noted that Senator Chiles of Florida, while he was not on the committee, did have significant input to the Carl Perkins Act and was constantly concerned about the legislation doing what it ought to do for economic development in the states. Senator Quayle of Indiana played a role in the development of the Act. He wanted to insert strong components that would introduce a private sector and labor initiative into the Act. There were significant discussions among the staffs of Senators Pell, Quayle and Stafford relating to Senator Quayle's proposals. While Quayle didn't win most of his proposals, the ideas were planted and will be recurring in future legislation.

It is significant to note that the National Education Association joined with women's advocacy groups to take the lead in sex equity issues and that the power of the NEA made the sex equity issues one of the foremost issues in the passage of the Carl Perkins Act; thus, leading to the various set-asides for career development of women and training of women in occupations. Any given year, Congress will be more specific with set-asides than they are in another year. Sometimes the Congress goes to broad grants and sometimes to specific set-asides, depending on how restrictive or how much punishment they want to give to the states who administer the programs. If they do not feel that the states have responded, then it is certain that there will be a form of punishment or form of saying, 'you did not respond, therefore we are going to make you do this', in the form of a mandate or set-aside or a requirement to spend certain funds on certain issues. If they feel the states have been responsive, or the states can convince them that they are willing to do the job, then there will be less chance of set-asides.

The issues and concerns related to sex equity which were addressed by Congress in 1984, were not considered in isolation but as they related to the economic development problems facing this country at that time and those anticipated in the late '80's and even into the 90's. Sex equity issues were used as a prybar, or catalyst, to move other issues by members of Congress. Those members who were strong advocates for sex equity issues were used by the leadership of the Committee to bring together the coalitions that were to move vocational education into more of an economic development arena.

It is apparent that equity in the workplace is a necessity of economic growth and development. These strong concerns by some members of Congress were brought into the Committee's deliberations and brought into the halls of Congress, and they were a driving force for some changes that other members of Congress wanted to make. This bears out the opinion that no legislative issue stands alone and that they are all brought into the 'stew', and from the process comes a compromise of legislative mandates that lead to legislation that although not supported by everyone, gets the job done.

• • • •

The profession of vocational educators has traditionally had the most significant impact on vocational legislation. Other groups/organizations have been convened by the vocational profession. Organizations such as the governors [association], state legislators, private sector organizations; and components of vocational education; such as the disadvantaged, handicapped; or even sex equity components have turned to the profession in general as the leader for reauthorization of vocational education. That was true in '76; but less in '84 and [will be] less in future years. Various segments of the vocational community and others are viewing vocational legislation as too important for the vocational community to control; perhaps an oversimplification, but what it says to me is that other organizations are adamantly interested in the role of the Federal dollar in vocational education. They are no longer going to allow the accepted, traditional vocational community to determine the issues and to shape the nature of the Federal role in vocational education.

A significant part of this is the private sector involvement in vocational education and the role that sex equity components have when the private sector is involved. The private sector is going to insist on quality control in vocational education in the coming years; going to insist on some measure of policy for vocational education -- the administration/delivery of vocational education will rest where it is! However, if the major concern of the private sector doesn't relate to the improvement of women in the workforce, which it has not done up to this point, then their seeking of some input into policy and into quality standards, may be of concern to the sex equity community. The major way to address this is to communicate the data concerning the workforce, and the role of women in the workforce, in the coming years. That factor alone is so significant that employers are going to have to listen to the arguments and treat the Vocational Education Act, along with other federal legislative initiatives, with a concern and an eye to the role of women in the workplace.

One of the major roles of federal vocational education legislation should be to ensure that vocational education is in tune with economic development issues. This means the preparation of all people to enter the workforce, but especially women because the volume is so great that they can't be ignored and shouldn't be denied when education and training are an issue.

The demographic data are so strong that the states/local entities, along with Congress, can't ignore the sex equity issue. They must pay attention to moving, fully and effectively, women into the workforce as well as promoting and maintaining men in the workforce. There's no way that a productive economy can do without the fullest effort of either segment.

• • • •

Whether there will be a regression of sex equity issues is doubtful. I don't think we have a record in this country of regressing on civil rights issues. The question remains as to how do we assure that we do progress.

Some states would have addressed the sex equity issue and some were addressing the issue. Nationally, the states would not have fully addressed the issue of sex equity without the funds being provided by Congress and without the mandated sex-asides for sex equity coordinators. Probably it was necessary to establish that coordinator position in each state -- necessary because change in bureaucracies and change in the establishment comes slowly and a purely leadership role wouldn't have provided the change necessary to create the momentum for women in the workforce.

It seems that the consciousness of the states is much greater. The issue is before the general population in a much stronger way ... Obviously, with data about the workforce, the U.S. can't afford to do less than fully develop women as a full partner; or as a recognized major segment of the workforce. With this in mind, it is not at all clear, at this point, whether there needs to be a continued mandate or whether the purpose of that segment of federal funds, has been accomplished. If it has not been accomplished, then it should continue to be there, and the mandate and the pressure continued on the states. If the major role has been accomplished it seems contrary to good policy/legislation to segment federal funds out into these positions.

• • • •

The main problem with the old law, although it had all this great language in it, was that there was no money. We knew that as long as it had just been authorized but not required, we would never get any money spent on sex equity. We just knew that! All the statistics proved this. Some states chose to spend some money for displaced homemakers, but in terms of programs to overcome sex bias; nothing! And of course there wasn't that much money spent on displaced homemakers.

So when reauthorization came up, of course, the Coalition's first priority was trying to get money set-aside from the basic grant for sex equity stuff. We were told by everybody that this was a TOTAL IMPOSSIBILITY because of the Reagan administration. The trend was toward simplification, toward getting rid of set-asides, to let the states do what they wanted to do. We were just told flat out -- IT'S IMPOSSIBLE [author's emphasis]! I remember going to a preliminary meeting with Janet Wells and Jack Jennings and Jack sitting there telling us that we were crazy to try for a set-aside because that was not where the trends were in Congress, and we would just be laughed at if we tried to push it. We were told to be realistic.

At certain points, we were advised to establish a separate title; to seek a separate authorization for sex equity. That was when Jack [Jennings] said maybe we could do that but it doesn't mean we were going to get funding, especially if separated from the basic grant. He indicated that something that's of lower priority, such as sex equity wouldn't get funded. We were kind of discouraged, but we went ahead.

Janet [Wells] left her position with the Federal Education Project, which closed its doors just as things started to heat up for reauthorization [around 1982]. She had developed testimony and when we testified in the House on the reauthorization on behalf of the Coalition, we based our testimony on what she had written. Based on Janet Wells' work, we developed the recommendations for the Coalition which included a set-aside for sex equity and displaced homemakers. We produced reams of paper ... my files were this thick. I finally threw it all away; maybe I shouldn't have. The Coalition approved the concept of working for a set-aside for sex equity; our original proposal was not the way it finally emerged.

• • • •

When we [the Coalition] were developing our recommendations for the legislation, we made contact with the vocational education community. The Vocational Education Task Force met with both Gene Bottoms and Dean Griffin of AVA several times and reviewed our proposals. I don't think they took us seriously at all. We were just a bunch of ladies trying to get the AVA to endorse our proposal and they were never going to do that in a million years; but they didn't fight us, so that helped. The AVA carried a lot of clout and had an 'in' with the people who counted; people like Jack Jennings. In the past, what AVA wanted, they got; they were very powerful. However, I don't think they spent enough time dealing with people like us and they became over-confident. Jack Jennings knew how strongly we felt about what we wanted and he didn't hear any objections from the AVA because they didn't take us seriously. In addition, George Miller was pushing for equity, so Jennings said, 'Let's do it.'

I believe that those advocacy groups that tried to work with AVA decided that it was time to push on without the AVA. AVA did not support us verbally or with action. For example, when we went to the Conference Committee, we wanted to ask for what was in the bill (8 percent). AVA said there was no way we were going to get that amount and they wouldn't ask for it; so, we decided to go ahead without AVA and came out with 11 percent.

AVA supports vocational education in general and would rather not get into specific or special issues, but that doesn't mean that others don't have the right to get what they want out of vocational education. Maybe that's something that AVA must come to understand.

Originally, we wanted one pot of money ... What happened is that in the midst of all this, Senator Orrin Hatch developed a proposal for the reauthorization of vocational education which included a set-aside for homemakers; just homemakers. Senator Hatch was concerned that there were all of these homemakers out there that nobody cared about; they wanted to go to school and get some vocational training and nobody was supporting them. If you read the legislation now it doesn't say 'displaced homemakers', it says homemakers, with special consideration for displaced homemakers. We got that in there. We read his [Hatch's] version of the bill and stated that it should be displaced homemakers and should include single parents and programs to overcome sex bias and stereotyping. (Non-traditional programs were not mentioned and the bill did not emphasize any specific kind of program.) The interesting part about it was Senator Hatch was totally opposed to any kind of language about overcoming sex bias and stereotyping and any kind of language that encouraged people to enter non-traditional careers. He called it social engineering. That was the phrase his aide used. Another thing Hatch absolutely refused to do was to require the use of money for support services. We finally got the support services in as 'permitted' but that wasn't in earlier versions. We wanted it required and he absolutely refused. He didn't understand that single mothers and homemakers needed child care services.

An interesting fact is that Orrin Hatch's first proposal stated that the sex equity coordinators should administer the funds. He was utterly committed to that idea. Maybe it was because he liked Barbara Hales [Utah SEC] so much, but he wouldn't allow anyone to change who would administer the funds. I think this 'stuck in the throat' of AVA.

Hatch's aide, was given the assignment of getting the National Coalition to approve his piece of legislation. The aide contacted us and said, 'Here's this piece of legislation, will you approve it'? Of course, we wouldn't approve something that was a set-aside out of vocational education money for homemakers only. I think Senator Hatch must have conveyed to his aide that it was very important to get our approval because they were willing to make certain alterations and small compromises to curry our favor. The thing that sticks in my mind is that the aide was furious at us for refusing to fully endorse the Hatch bill. We said there was a lot of good stuff in it, but we could not wholeheartedly embrace it. He was just furious after working so hard to get our approval.

The wounds were still fresh from the 1980 election and it was just not easy to put all of that aside. One day, Hatch's aide called us into his office. We sat down, and he said, 'I want to talk to you about this.' He proceeded to yell at us that we had to accept a compromise. We said it's not a matter of compromise, it's a very important principle. We cannot fully endorse this piece of legislation because it doesn't have anything about sex bias and stereotyping and non-traditional programming, which we believe is really important. He said unless we endorsed the legislation fully he would never deal with us again. He called us unprofessional and said that other people who worked on this kind of thing knew when to accept compromise and when not to, and that we weren't acting in good faith. I know that he thought he was going to rattle us by saying all this stuff. We were just furious but kept our cool; just barely! We left knowing we were risking a lot but we couldn't see any other way. There was the temptation to say let's take what we can get and go for it, but we had too much invested to compromise our principles. So we said -- nothing! As it turned out, it was a scare tactic.

We knew the bill probably wouldn't go far enough so we started to visit other members of the Committee to get them to work with us on changing the Hatch proposal. It was a good thing that we took this seriously. I think that it was Cindy Marano who realized that this was a serious situation. Hatch was Chair of the Committee at that time and it was a Republican dominated Senate. Cindy realized that if we were going to get anything we would have to get it through the Republicans on the Senate side. That was pretty smart thinking. We contacted Paula Hawkins' staff and talked to a staff person named Bill Winsman. He agreed with us wholeheartedly about a single parent set-aside, and said Paula Hawkins agreed also. Paula Hawkins and Bill Winsman worked with Senator Hatch's staff and they agreed that single parents should be added.

The House bill was debated first and it was fairly easy to get that piece of legislation. What Representative George Miller had proposed was closer to what we had recommended. George Miller, and a person on his staff by the name of John Bennett, agreed with us about getting rid of discrimination in vocational education. They said that sex bias was rampant and it was terrible. John Bennett and George Miller were probably as forceful, if not more so than we about this. We cared about displaced homemakers and single parents but he [Miller] was really concerned about having programs to overcome bias and stereotyping. He believed that vocational education was terribly sexist and segregated and wanted the sex equity provisions. George Miller wanted it, he fought for it, and it stayed. When the bill came to conference he refused to budge and Hatch refused to budge. That's why we ended up with both set-asides.

You couldn't find a better advocate than George Miller ... I felt so sad when he left that Committee. He was one member of the Congress that truly believed what we were saying. He was totally, utterly convinced and wouldn't back down one bit. I mean, if we had wanted to back down, he wouldn't have let us. He and his staff were just great. Working with them was up front; we were a team and we consulted with and taught each other. There was a lot of give and take, a lot of free flow of information. John Bennett was very concerned that we not give away anything to the Senate side, that we not compromise. He was very concerned that we wouldn't do anything to undercut what had been put together in the House. I think he was really proud of what he did too. We sent them flowers [when the legislation passed].

Everyone said what came out of the Conference Committee was a miracle. The House and Senate bills themselves were totally different, even the sex equity part. We couldn't figure out how they were going to mesh these differences; it was like apples and oranges. We had no inkling at all that we'd get both bills out of Conference. We were shocked! Cindy [Marano] went up to the conference hearings. I remember talking to Cindy and saying, 'What happened?' She said we got both because neither side would give in. George Miller absolutely refused and he was supported by Perkins. I think Perkins' staff, especially Jack Jennings and Nancy Kober, were on our side and they were able to get certain things adopted because they themselves believed in it. A great deal of the final language in the Perkins' bill came from the Senate version and I think that some people felt that if Perkins had been in better shape he would have fought more for the House version.

• • • •

What we attempted to do [in '84] and this was a real political education for me, was to try to make the Senate process; primarily Republican, and the House process; primarily Democratic, play one off against the other so that each would try to outdo the other to please the women. That strategy kind of evolved along the way.

On the Senate side, we worked with a staff person for Senator Hatch who was extremely unpleasant. If we had not been absolutely determined, we would never have made it. This man insulted us every time we were together. He told us we didn't know what we were doing (and since we weren't so sure about what we were doing, we were scared to death). It was a very important lobbying experience for me because I really did learn how to deal with a hostile response and still make it work.

• • • •

It was a very interesting process. A couple of anecdotes from the period. George Miller had a wonderful young man working as his staff person who brought together the handicapped groups, the disadvantaged groups, and the sex equity groups to come up with a joint strategy. It was really the staff person's brilliant idea. What we did was ask for more money and add sex equity to the pot, since adding sex equity would not negatively impact the other set-asides. As we moved further into the authorization process, all groups worked together for the package. It was wonderful.

We had no idea that we would be as successful as we were. I think it is unquestioningly the case that had we tried to do it four years earlier, we would not have succeeded. The climate had changed; it was an election year. Orrin Hatch, for example certainly wouldn't have supported us or taken the role he did if it had been earlier. He was extremely interested in trying to improve his standing among women so it wasn't a coincidence. It was because the climate had changed and we did not take an equity approach; we took an economic approach.

After [the legislation was passed] people got real excited about it, but I'm telling you the lack of interest beforehand was appalling. There were a lot of people who could care less about vocational education. So we [Vocational Education Task Force] were given carte blanche to do whatever we wanted to do. We'd run these proposals through the Coalition and the people would be 'half asleep' and okay everything. Therefore, the Vocational Education Task Force ran the show. There were just a few groups that really cared. On the whole, there was not much interest ... not even from the SEC's.

Marie Mayor [SEC, Maryland] came to our meetings, and we felt that she was the spokesperson for the sex equity coordinators. We cleared a lot of the stuff through her and she gave her approval when needed. But we knew that the sex equity coordinators, as a group, were not doing anything. There were a few that we used to do grassroots stuff, like contacting people in key states. We definitely worked with them but as a group the sex equity coordinators basically were not there. They were so afraid they were going to lose what was in the '76 Amendments that many of them were not interested in rocking the boat. Some were concerned about what we were doing. I got inklings that there were a lot of scared sex equity coordinators -- kind of hiding under the covers while we did the work.

• • • •

The SEC's contracted with Anna Biermeier to develop a position paper for reauthorization based on input from the coordinators. VEEC's thinking was small compared to the women's organizations and advocates proposal. We felt it would be a miracle if we could retain what we had in the legislation. The set-aside of $50,000 was controversial all along and was one of the issues to be debated in the reauthorization. The old law said that states must reserve $50,000 to support the coordinator and the ten functions of the job. This was always seen as somewhat unequitable because of the difference in the size and needs of the various states.

Also, ... we knew, based on the NIE study and based on our experience, that states were not, by and large, going to create a sufficient allocation for populations, such as displaced homemakers and single parents.

Orrin Hatch and Paula Hawkins, saying that they wanted $100 million nationally for women's programs was totally unexpected. Many people associated these types of programs with the Democrats or the people that are more liberal. They [Democrats] were proposing a very small set-aside. When the bill got to the Conference Committee, the House and the Senate negotiated and, I think for the first time in history, added the recommendations from both sides together and came up with an even bigger set-aside than had been in either version. It was really interesting.

• • • •

The National Association of State Directors (NASDVE) has long been a powerful force in vocational education and a strong political entity in the legislative arena. The close alliance between AVA and NASDVE has made it possible for them to achieve a great deal for vocational education. There is no doubt that vocational education would have been relegated to the 'back burner' during the past decades, as education itself went through many upheavals, if it had not been for the joint efforts of these two professional groups. Throughout the years they kept in close contact with the 'movers and shakers' on the state and national scene and were expert in building support for their initiatives; however, they misread the concerns/desires of Congress regarding sex equity and the intent of the vocational legislation passed in 1976 and 1984. The results of this fact will be felt for years to come. It is important to stress that the progress achieved on sex equity in vocational education is a direct result of that 'misreading'.

• • • •

The thing that amazes me ... is how many times you have to tell the vocational education community what the hell the problem is. It is apparent, at least since 1972, that Congress was concerned about at-risk populations ... Congress keeps coming back with a stronger and stronger set-aside ... the issue was so powerful and the data were so strong you couldn't miss it [intentions of Congress]. You could just see the reactions of the Congressional people, they were furious about the lack of response [by states].

• • • •

It wasn't until the Perkins Act in '84 that the schizophrenia of vocational education became full blown. There were two camps; one camp said vocational education should be an education bill -- Vocational Skills Education. This camp was led by Gene Bottoms and many male state directors. The other camp said, 'No, we've got to continue the movement of '76 and make this a social piece of legislation' -- and that camp won out. When Congress said 57 percent of the funds should be used for at-risk populations, I think Congress was making a very clear statement -- that the Federal Government is not in business to fund state activities for vocational education; they're in business to help at-risk population participate in vocational education. That's at important distinction. That's now where Congress wants to put its dollars.

• • • •

Back in '83, AVA was trying to consolidate as many agencies as possible who were interested in reauthorization and they put forth a bill that cut back on equity. It was just so clear that the people up on the Hill were not going to listen because they [AVA] were just protecting their own vested interest. AVA did not see where Congress was going. I was surprised that AVA wanted to adhere to their 1983 position because I knew it was history and 'chips' were not going to make it happen. It's an interesting story.

Congress knows that the equity coordinators are not being assigned full administrative responsibilities for the set-asides... Already legislative material has come out (since '84), in which Congress has expressed concern with the Education Department's [U.S.] failure to enforce this. I suspect the next round will make it very clear that the full time coordinator must have autonomy and they must have greater authority and discretion with regard to the funding decisions on the set-asides.

There has been a much greater turnover in state directors than in sex equity coordinators, which says something in itself. But, keep in mind the position of the state directors in most state bureaucracies. You have the chief state school officer, most generally the superintendent, and then you have the bureaucracy going down, and somewhere down there is the state director. Some state directors are assistant commissioners or assistant superintendents and some are no higher than branch chiefs. So the state directors are hanging on for dear life. I think whenever there's a proposed change, their jobs are very much in jeopardy in a particular state.

There is a pecking order and somewhere in the pecking order there is a sex equity coordinator. I think that the decision to put so many people with home economics backgrounds in the position of sex equity coordinator was purposely done. I think the state directors wanted to make sure that 'this' doesn't get out of hand and that total control was maintained. There are many states still where the sex equity coordinator does not have direct access to the state director. The sex equity coordinator reports to a branch chief who might report to somebody else who reports to the state director. So the pecking order has stayed in line, and I think, again, it was intentionally done. This way you set up barriers to make sure that the sex equity coordinator does not have direct access to the state director. That weakens the position. The reason that this is going on is both ideological and philosophical.

Today, a new breed of person is becoming state director in many states in this country; people who do not have a vocational education background but who have a management background. Where you have the management types taking over that position, the equity coordinator has greater access to the state director. Where you've got the typical vocational education person from the '50s mindset as a state director, with the old 'Vokie' background, you still find that there's a great deal of distance, purposely done, to keep the sex equity coordinator at bay. It's really unfortunate and it's certainly not what Congress envisioned when they put this in place.

States that have put women in as state directors are making a very wise decision. They are making a statement to their state bureaucracy, if nothing else, that we are no longer in the 1950's and we need to look to the future.

• • • •

As I look back, I think it was the women who saved vocational education. The interesting part of the '84 experience was that vocational education was truly on the ropes. There were lots of Congressmen who were saying that this system stinks; it's outmoded, outdated, entrenched and we just need to get rid of it because there's no fixing it! I think women strengthened vocational education and made it better. They forced vocational education to change, not only in the equity ways, but in ways that make it more responsive to what it needed to be doing.

However, I still worry. We have been so successful in so short a period of time that the results have become institutionalized in a sense. Part of me says well, that was our goal; we want equity to be institutionalized. But the other side of it is, and it's at both the coordinators' level and the local level, that you lose the advocacy; the drive to make things even better, to try something new. Your goals become more merged with the institution than with the mission. You see yourself having opportunities for leadership that you would never have had before. A lot of sex equity coordinators want to be state directors and probably some will be, I think some of them will bring equity with them, but some won't. They want the position; they don't want the issue. I see some similarities with Civil Rights, and people thinking it's institutionalized...

• • • •

In looking to the future, [regarding the legislative process] it's important to note the difference between the former Chair of the Committee, the late Carl D. Perkins, and the current chair, Augustus Hawkins. Their style is completely different. Once Perkins decided he was going to accept something, he did not waver and Mr. Perkins was in absolute control of his committee. If he wanted something, it happened. Perkins cracked the whip! He kept his Democrats in line and the Democrats were the majority. Sometimes you could get something through that Perkins didn't care about, but not if he cared.

Hawkins is much more colleagial and a much nicer guy but he doesn't get the same response from committee members. Therefore, for reauthorization, a different process will be needed. It may be necessary to work every single member of the Committee to get them in line with a particular stand. Hawkins is much more our friend in terms of civil rights and equity things, but he doesn't control his committee the way that Perkins did. This was obvious when they voted on the abortion amendments. The Democrats bolted and took an anti-abortion stand while Hawkins voted for the amendments.

• • • •

Working in the area of women's issues/equity is innately interesting and extremely important work. I'm highly motivated to try things out. I think most of what we're doing is very experimental. We're creating a whole new human resource system and slowly transforming the system that we now have. I see it is a very long-term process. I see it as sort of chipping away at a lot of things that don't work very well; to try to find all the different nooks and crannies, to intrude into systems that don't work very well and to try to shift things around.

General Issues

> Phyllis McClure, Cindy Brown and Norman Chachkin authored the Lawyer's Committee for Civil Rights, 1975 report, Race and Sex Equity in Vocational Education. This was a significant piece of paper as far as the Office of Education [was concerned]. Phyllis McClure was a well-known advocate for improved opportunities for minorities; Margaret Dunkle, Chair of the Coalition, knew how to make legislation happen and the Feds knew it.

These women felt that the women's movement had focused attention on professional women. Even though professional women needed help they were better able to stand up for themselves, but there was no one to help disadvantaged boys and girls.

> ... if you really wanted to sell sex equity and do something good, you had to ignore the professionals, the lawyers, the doctors and focus on where the need was greatest -- and that was vocational education! ... It wasn't any accident at all. We didn't focus on what's wrong with vocational education ... it started out as, how can we help a disadvantaged group -- and the rest is history!

Following are a series of comments by a variety of people.

The Federal office was just like any other office of vocational education. It didn't know what the issues were, it was not personally conscious of the need for sex equity and here was some 'damn social engineering legislation' that it was forced to administer. The staff's track record in providing Federal leadership was spotty. They did issue a few contracts to do sex equity kinds of things, but by and large what the sex equity coordinators needed, the Federal office was not at all willing to provide. They weren't willing to provide an ongoing national conference; they were barely willing to provide an updated roster of individuals once a year. They weren't willing to develop policy at the first sign of problems. I remember I was instructed to have at least five to six letters of inquiry, or difficulty, before they would even consider drafting a policy. There was a system whereby the state equity coordinators could call and tell the sex equity specialist their problems, but their [state] agency would not make an official request for policy clarification. It was a wonderful system for not establishing a policy.

A lot of concern was precipitated by the MERC Reviews. States were not in compliance with the law. Reviewers and advocates for equity were hoping that the states might get their hands slapped a little bit. By and large, the Federal perspective was ... 'we don't want to rock the boat'. That's why evaluations and monitoring by advocacy groups were so important and helpful.

• • • •

Charles Buzzell was head of the Bureau [BOAE] and Martha Harris was his Special Advisor on Women's Issues. She was another surprise. We tended to see her as Charlie Buzzell's assistant and we were very cautious with her -- but she was saying all the 'right' things. Linda Brown and I had dinner with her at an Atlantic City conference and suddenly discovered that she was just absolutely wonderful, a tremendous supporter. So that gave us an entree into Buzzell's office (After Reagan came in, she looked around and saw she would never be able to do anything in her position and decided to take an early retirement.)

• • • •

Things changed during the Carter administration. I think Janet [Wells] would agree. There was access and openness to advocates who were advocates for women. Some people were amazed that they could actually get an appointment to see the Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary or the Assistant Secretary herself.

• • • •

Joy Simonson had hired an intern who came in for the summer and analyzed the comments submitted regarding the regulations. I can no longer remember what all the issues were but about 30 issues were identified. These were reduced down to about 12 or 13 that we wanted in the law; like saying 'the sex equity coordinator had to be qualified for the job,' so that it wouldn't go to the state director, and that 'the person had to work full time.' I think one of the issues we stressed was that it had to be a full time position.

The meeting with the vocational staff that followed I want recorded for history. The staff and their lawyer were hostile to our demands. I had been trained by advocates -- so was firm and indicated that these were our demands and this is what had to be done. There was so much reneging when Reagan came in. We got wind that they (the administration) were planning to issue new regs and destroy everything that had been done to date ... The full time coordinator position would no longer be required. OVAE denied that this was happening, but we got a draft of the proposed changes. The Coalition for Women and Girls in Education had a meeting with Bob Worthington. He nearly died when we walked in with this draft that he had denied existed. He said, 'I cannot discuss this with you. It would be a violation of the Administrative Procedures Act if we talked about this.' However, the regulations remained intact.

• • • •

It was during this period that a national conference was held which was not really supported by the Federal Office of Vocational Education. It was up to the equity coordinators to pretty much be their own leaders. Workshops were held around the country. People were just crying for an understanding of what they were supposed to do, and how they could do it. They were looking for model programs. This was a whole new area that many people just did not know how to handle.

The coordinators were not given a lot of authority to carry out their jobs and in some cases equity money had been siphoned into other areas that didn't fall under the requirements of the law. Written documentation of these irregularities did not always result in change.

Some believed that all of the equity coordinators should be from some area of vocational education, but we had a few who were from the general areas in liberal arts. We found that they had a lot to offer in a non-vocational perspective that was very important. So I think as far as the passage of the Carl Perkins Act was concerned, what really contributed to the recognition that individuals were not receiving equitable treatment was the fine mix of coordinators ... we also had a few men as coordinators and they addressed some of the issues that men face.

• • • •

I want to mention Shirley McCune. She was a very important person and should be included in this history. She ran a number of the regional sex equity coordinator's conferences when she was at CCSSO. (She had that little book, Try It, You'll Like It.) She was one of the few people who tried desperately to do something we need even today; that is, to define the profession of educational equity. She's a person who believes in comprehensive equity, race, national origin, sex, etc. Also she was concerned about methodology and practice and defining standards. We don't have anyone who's doing that today.

We've not really achieved that ultimate integration and connection, and I feel that we need some help with 'defining the field'. We can't go on saying that everything is a strategy in equity. We are completely cut off from university researchers and it's one of the saddest things for me as a practitioner. I don't know where the women's studies departments are in this country. There is no connection between me and the feminist scholars and there's no connection between me and vocational education scholars and researchers. I am left, as is every other equity professional, to try and determine things for myself. We don't know what we are. Are we an infusion strategy? Are we something that's related to everything? I didn't expect that as equity coordinator that I would have to learn every aspect of the delivery system of every vocational area. I don't think people who are not equity coordinators appreciate what generalists we have been forced to become in order to make appropriate connections.

• • • •

The Federal role in vocational education, with the Land Grant Colleges and the Smith Hughes Act, is different than its role in general education. For that reason, states and local school districts expect the federal government to take the lead.

APPENDIX D

STUDY PARTICIPANTS

Jane E. Adair
Program Specialist - Sex Equity (former)
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20202

Neal D. Andrew, Deputy Commissioner
Department of Education (Retired)
101 Pleasant Street
Concord, New Hampshire 03301

Deborah Ashford, Attorney at Law
Hogan and Hartson
555 Thirteenth Street, NW
Washington, DC 20004

Barbara A. Bitters, Administrator
Vocational Equity and Single Parent Programs
Department of Public Instruction
125 South Webster Street
Madison, Wisconsin 53707

Cynthia G. Brown, Director
Resource Center for Educational Equity; Council of Chief State School Officers
400 North Capital Street, NW - Suite 379
Washington, DC 20010

Michael Brustein, Attorney at Law
Brustein and Mainusevit, P.C.
3105 South Street, NW
Washington, DC

Charles H. Buzzell, Executive Director
American Vocational Association
1410 King Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Theresa Cusick
Senior Associate for Public Policy
PEER/NOWLDEF
520 Whittier Street, NW
Washington, DC 20012

Sheryl Dembo, Director
Mid Atlantic Equity Center
5010 Wisconsin Avenue, NW
Suite 301
Washington, DC 20016

Shirley Downs
Alfred E. Smith State Office Building 7015
Albany, New York 12225

Nishma Duffy
Consultant in Equal Access Education; Bureau of
Vocational Technical Education
101 Pleasant Street
Concord, New Hampshire 03301

Daniel B. Dunham, Executive Director; Oregon Alliance for Program Development
301 Snell Hall
Oregon State University
Corvallis, Oregon 97331-1631

Margaret Dunkle, Director
Equity Center
220 "I" Street, NE - Suite 250
Washington, DC 20002

Carol Eliason (Retired)
Director of Development
Close-up Foundation
1235 Jefferson Davis Hwy.
Arlington, Virginia 22202

Mary Ann Etu
Occupational Education Equity Supervisor
New York State Education Department
Room 16130CP
Albany, New York 12234

Nancy Evans, Executive Director
ACTION OHIO - Coalition for Battered Women
P.O. Box 15673
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Fern A. Green, Executive Director
Oklahoma Council on Vocational Education
4545 North Lincoln - Suite 159
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105

Dean Griffin, President
Partners for American Vocational Education, Inc.
208 North Washington Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Barbara B. Hales, Specialist
Vocational Equity
Utah State Office of Education
250 East 500 South
Salt Lake City, Utah 84604

Sara Harder, President
American Association of University Women
2401 Virginia Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20037

Madelina B. Hemmings
Executive Director
NASDVE
1420 16th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Dr. Addison S. Hobbs
Assistant State Superintendent
Vocational-Technical Education
200 West Baltimore Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

John F. Jennings, Counsel
Committee on Education and Labor
United States House of Representatives
B-346-C Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Laura G. Johns
Education Program Specialist
United States Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, SW
Reporters Building - Room 606
Washington, DC 20202

Roslyn Kane, Consultant
1223 Race Street, Apt. 201
Denver, Colorado 80206

Holly Knox
1484 Roundleaf Court
Reston, Virginia 22090

Nancy Kober
Government Relations Consultant
Route 7, Box 180
Charlottesville, Virginia 22901

Rosemary Kolde, Associate Superintendent
Great Oaks J.V.S.D.
3254 East Kemper Road
Cincinnati, Ohio 45241

Mary G. Lovell
Education Research Advisor
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, SW
Room 4512 Switzer
Washington, DC 20202

Cynthia E. Marano, Executive Director
Wider Opportunities for Women
1325 G Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005

Carol O'Neill Mayhew
Supervisor, Sex Equity
State Department of Public Instruction
Townsend Building
Dover, Delaware 19720

Marie Mayor, Section Chief
State Planning, Finance, and Facilities
DVTE, Maryland Department of Education
5459 Halflight Garth
Columbia, Maryland 21045

Phyllis P. McClure
Division of Legal Information and Community Service
NAACP Legal Defense & Educational Fund, Inc.
1275 K Street, W - Suite 301
Washington, DC 20005

Shirley McCune, Senior Director
MCREL, Inc.
12500 East Iliff
Aurora, Colorado 80014

Harriet Medaris
10324 Mockingbird Pond Court
Burke, Virginia 22015

Jill Miller, Executive Director
Displaced Homemakers Network
1411 K Street, NW - Suite 930
Washington, DC

Mary Ann Millsap
Senior Research Associate
ABT Associates, Inc.
55 Wheeler Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

Ruth Nadel
Women's Bureau
U.S. Department of Labor
200 Constitution Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20210

Beverly Postlewaite
Associate Dean of Instruction
Highline Community College
P O Box 98000
Des Moines, Iowa 98198-9800

Beryl Shoemaker
State Director of
Vocational Education
92 Ceramic Drive
Columbus, Ohio 43214

Joan Siebert
Career/Vocational Specialist
10531 Southwest Capital Highway
Portland, Oregon 97219

Joy R. Simonson
Professional Staff Member
Employment and Housing Subcommittee
Government Operations Committee
U.S. House of Representatives
B-349-A Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Amanda J. Smith
Management and Education Consultant
in Gender Equity
1900 Winkler Road
Durham, North Carolina 27712

Ann T. Smith, Vocational
Specialist
Department of Postsecondary
Education
4505 Executive Park Drive
Montgomery, Alabama 36116

Ella Stolz
1475 Sunset Drive
Huron, South Dakota 57350

Mary Ellen Veheyden-Hilliard
Equity Institute
4715 Cordell Avenue
Bethesda, Maryland 20814

Janet Wells
Director of Publications
National Citizens' Coalition
for Nursing Home Reform
1424 16th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20016

Leslie R. Wolfe
Executive Director
Center for Women Policy Studies
2000 P Street, NW - Suite 508
Washington, DC 20036

APPENDIX E

FEDERAL PERSONNEL, 1973-1988

(All information is from the U.S. Government Manual, published yearly by the Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Service, General Services Administration)

July, 1973

Department of Health, Education and Welfare:
  Casper W. Weinberger, Secretary
Office of Education:
  Commissioner of Education: John R. Ottina
  Deputy Commissioner for Occupational and Adult Education: William F. Pierce
  Director, Center for Adult Vocational and Technical Education: Robert M. Worthington
  Director, Division of Vocational-Technical Education: Michael E. Russo
  Director, Division of Vocational Education Research: Howard F. Hjelm

May 1, 1975

Department of Health, Education and Welfare:
  Secretary: Casper W. Weinberger
  Assistant Secretary for Education: Virginia Y. Trotter
Office of Education:
  Commissioner: Terrell H. Bell
  Deputy Commissioner: William F. Pierce
  Associate Commissioner for Adult Vocational, Technical and Manpower Division: Charles H. Buzzell (Acting)
  Associate Commissioner for Occupational Planning: Charles H. Buzzell

May 1, 1976

Department of Health, Education and Welfare:
  Secretary: Casper W. Weinberger
  Assistant Secretary for Education: Virginia Y. Trotter
Office of Education:
  Commissioner: Terrell H. Bell
  Deputy Commissioner: William F. Pierce
  Associate Commissioner: Charles H. Buzzell (Acting)

May 1, 1977

Department of Health, Education and Welfare:
  Secretary: Joseph A. Califano, Jr.
  Education Division: Assistant Secretary for Education: Mary Berry

May 1, 1977 (Continued)

Office of Education:
  Commissioner: Ernest L. Boyer
  Deputy Commissioner: Charles H. Buzzell (Acting)
  Associate Commissioner: Charles H. Buzzell

May 1, 1978

Department of Health, Education and Welfare:
  Secretary: Joseph A. Califano, Jr.
  Education Division: Assistant Secretary: Mary Berry
Office of Education:
  Commissioner: Ernest L. Boyer
  Deputy Commissioner: Charles H. Buzzell (Acting)
  Associate Commissioner: Howard F. Hjelm (Acting)

May 1, 1979

Department of Health, Education and Welfare:
  Secretary: Joseph A. Califano (then, Patricia H. Roberts)
  Education Division: Assistant Secretary: Mary Berry
Office of Education:
  Commissioner: Ernest L. Boyer (resigned 6-30-79)
  Deputy Commissioner for Occupational and Adult Education: Danial B. Dunham
  Associate Commissioner for Adult Vocational, Technical, and Manpower Education: Charles H. Buzzell

First Secretary of Education was sworn in on December 6, 1979.

May 1, 1980

Secretary of Education: Shirley M. Hufstedler
Assistant Secretary for Vocational and Adult Education: Daniel B. Dunham (Acting)

May 1, 1981

Secretary of Education: Terrell H. Bell
Acting Assistant Secretary for Vocational and Adult Education: Howard F. Hjelm

(By December, 1981, Robert M. Worthington was confirmed; Charles H. Buzzell was Director, Policy Analysis and Legislation)

July 1, 1982

Secretary of Education: Terrell H. Bell
Assistant Secretary for Vocational and Adult Education: Robert M. Worthington

July 1, 1983

Secretary of Education: Terrell H. Bell
Assistant Secretary for Vocational and Adult Education:
Robert M. Worthington

(November 15, 1983, Charles H. Buzzell was Director, Policy Analysis Staff - last mention found of him)

May 1, 1984

Secretary of Education: Terrell H. Bell
Assistant Secretary for Vocational and Adult Education:
Robert M. Worthington

July 1, 1985

Secretary of Education: William J. Bennett
Assistant Secretary for Vocational and Adult Education:
Robert M. Worthington

June 1, 1986

Secretary of Education: William J. Bennett
Acting Assistant Secretary for Vocational and Adult Education:
John K. Wu

June 2, 1987

Secretary of Education: William J. Bennett
Acting Assistant Secretary for Vocational and Adult Education:
John G. Pucciano

December 11, 1987

Secretary of Education: William J. Bennett
Assistant Secretary for Vocational and Adult Education:
Henrietta F. (Bonnie) Guiton

June 1, 1988

Secretary of Education: William J. Bennett
Assistant Secretary for Vocational and Adult Education:
Henrietta F. (Bonnie) Guiton

APPENDIX F

OBJECTIVES OF THE PROJECT

OBJECTIVE 1

To document the development and implementation of federal vocational education sex equity legislation from 1976-1986 (later extended).

OBJECTIVE 2

To provide a written historical chronicle of events, contributors and programs and services resulting from the passage of federal legislation to improve equity in vocational education.

OBJECTIVE 3

To make recommendations for future policy and program directions for vocational education equity programs.

PROJECT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SEX EQUITY COORDINATORS

Ms. Jenny Erwin, Arizona
Mr. Gary Waters, Nevada
Ms. Barbara Hales, Utah
Ms. Jane E. Adair, U.S. Office of Education, Washington
Ms. Connie Gipson, California
Ms. Charlotte Carney-Gore, Florida
Ms. Joy Joseph, Louisiana
Ms. Mary Ann Etu, New York
Ms. Linda Greenwood, Rhode Island

APPENDIX G

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION SEX EQUITY LEGISLATION STUDY: QUESTIONNAIRE - PART I

Part I: General Information

A. Personal Data

1. Name ____________________ Title ____________________

2. Employer ____

3. Address ____
(Street) (City)

_______________ _______________ Tel. No. ( ) _______________
State Zip

4. Home Address ____

_______________ _______________ Tel. No. ( ) _______________
State Zip

5. High School Program of Study (check one)

Academic _____, Vocational _____, General _____, Other _____

6. Degrees Received

a) Baccalaureate: Major in ____________________

b) Masters: Major in ____________________

c) Doctorate: Major in ____________________

7. Are you a member of the Vocational Education Equity Council (VEEC)?

Yes____ No _____

a.) If your answer is no, please state your reasons for not joining. (Honest feedback is needed if the organization is to serve your needs).

b.) If a member, how has VEEC contributed to -

1. your professional growth and development?

2. the field of vocational education?

B. Work History by Age and Position

(If you left work for six months or more include at appropriate age level.)

Age	**Exact** Title of Position (e.g. High School Business Education Teacher, State Sex Equity Coordinator)

At age 25 yrs. my position was/is ______________________

At age ______ my position was/is ______________________

At age ______ my position was/is ______________________

At age ______ my position was/is ______________________

At age ______ my position was/is ______________________

At age ______ my position was/is ______________________

At age ______ my position was/is ______________________

At age ______ my position was/is ______________________

At age ______ my position was/is ______________________

C. Other

1. You are number _____ out of a total of ______ persons who have held the position of Sex Equity Coordinator (SEC) in your state since 19___.
2. Did you or anyone else perform functions similar to that of a SEC prior to the '76 Amendments (Oct. '77) ? Yes ______ No ______

   If yes, state the years: from 19____ to 19____

   If yes, give title of position: ____________________

ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS FROM YOUR PERSPECTIVE
AS THE CURRENT OR PAST SEX EQUITY COORDINATOR

Part II: Role in Development, Passage and/or Implementation of Sex Equity Legislation ('76 and '84)

A. Briefly identify your role in the development, passage, or implementation of any aspects of the legislation. Include individual and group activities and services at the national, state, and local level. For example, involvement in getting legislation passed by Congress, developing state plan/guidelines, assistance to local agencies, providing workshops, developing coalitions, etc. Complete those sections that apply only.

1. **National Level** (e.g., prepared and presented testimony at congressional hearings - representing local guidance counselors)

2. **State Level** (e.g., offered workshops for local directors of vocational education on requirements of the law; major responsibility for implementation of law)

3. **Local Level** Complete only if you were employed at anytime at the local level. (e.g., Revised curriculum to eliminate sex stereotypical language)

B. Indicate if and how you were involved in the development, passage, or implementation of any of the following federal laws concerning sex and discrimination.

1. Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 Yes_____ No_____
   Explain:

2. Equal Rights Restoration Act (In process) Yes_____ No_____
   Explain:

3. Other (Identify) Yes_____ No_____
   Explain:

Part III: Sex Equity Coordinator (SEC) Position at the State Level

A. Diagram your place in the organizational hierarchy (exclude those positions above state director).

B. Has this same structure existed since the SEC position was established? Yes____ No____

1) If no, describe changes:

2) What precipitated changes?

C. In your state the Sex Equity Coordinator (SEC) is classified as (check or complete one only):

1) an administrator ____
2) a supervisor ____
3) a consultant ____
4) a combination of __________ & ____________
5) other (identify) ________________________

D. Have you been able to fulfill the functions of the SEC as mandated under the law? Yes ____ No ____

1) If no, explain:

2) Percent of time spent on sex equity functions:
SE ____% Other____%

3) Other functions, activities, etc., assigned to you:

E. Do you think the legislative mandate to establish the SEC position in each state was necessary to insure change? Why?

1) In your state -

a) Was there a positive or negative reaction to such a position?

b) Was there a positive or negative reaction to the person hired for the position?

F. Has your state passed any sex equity education legislation similar to Title IX? Yes ____ No ____

G. Does your state education department have any sex equity policies that have the force of law? Yes ____ No ____

Part IV: Federal Vocational Education Sex Equity Legislation: Concerns and Issues

A. Respond to the following from a broad, global perspective

1. Identify issues, concerns, and/or events that you believe led to the recognition that all individuals were not receiving equitable treatment in vocational education and contributed to the passage of the '76 and '84 Acts.

2. What were your expectations for change and for enhancing opportunities for women in vocational education with the passage of the '76 and '84 Acts?

3. Were these changes realized as a result of the passage of the '76 and '84 Acts?

4. In your opinion, what was the most significant outcome of the '76 and '84 legislation?

5. Identify individuals, groups, or organizations who made major contributions to the development, passage, and implementation of the legislation:

	Name	Contribution
a) '76 Amendments:		
b) Carl Perkins Act:		

B. Respond to the following from a personal perspective

1. Do you think your state would have addressed the issue of sex equity in vocational education without the funds provided by the legislation? Explain.

2. Provide examples of innovative programs and services you were able to offer as a result of the federal legislation.

3. What do you think is the most significant outcome/change in your state in the area of sex equity during the past ten years?

4. List the major barriers you encountered (or still face) in implementing the provisions of the -

   a.) '76 Amendments:

   b.) Carl Perkins Act:

5. Identify successful techniques (enablers) you used to implement the law and/or stimulate others to address sex equity concerns;

   a.) State level:

   b.) Local level:

6. What do you predict will happen in the future regarding sex equity issues and concerns in vocational education? Will we see progress or set-backs?

APPENDIX H

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION SEX EQUITY LEGISLATION STUDY: QUESTIONNAIRE - PART II

A. **Personal Data:** Complete the following and return with your taped responses to Section II

1. Name ______________________ Title ______________________

2. Current Employer ______________________________

3. Address ______________________________
(Street) (City)

______________ ______________ Tel. No. (   )______________
(State) (Zip)

4. Home Address ______________________________
(Street) (City)

______________ ______________ Tel. No. (   )______________
(State) (Zip)

5. Degrees Received

   a.) Baccalaureate: Major in______________________________

   b.) Masters: Major in______________________________

   c.) Doctorate: Major in______________________________

6. Position and Employer when the following legislation was passed:

   a.) Voc. Amendments of 1976

   Position:

   Employer:

   b.) Carl Perkins Act of 1985

   Position:

   Employer:

Section II

Guidelines for Tape Recording Responses for Study

Introduction

From this point on, you will be sharing information, ideas, opinions and comments on audio-tape. Following are a series of questions or discussion items to gather data on your role in the development, passage and implementation of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1976, the Carl Perkins Act of 1984, other related sex equity legislation, issues and events which impacted on the passage of the legislation, and expectations and outcomes resulting from the legislation.

Under each topic there are questions/statements to guide your thinking and responses. You may want to review these before you begin to record. Try to respond to these items somewhere in your discussion. However, feel free to add additional information, to discuss items in-depth or make comments needed for clarification. It would be helpful if you would state on the tape the topic you are addressing and respond in the order presented. Consider the process "an interview without an interviewer".

Don't worry about making a perfect tape or spend time redoing or correcting it. Simply say what you feel and let it go. Be sure to test the tape at the beginning and periodically throughout the recording session to make sure everything is working properly. Please state your name at the beginning of the tape. Your name is needed for follow-up and reference purposes only. GOOD LUCK and many thanks for your help.

A. Role in Development Passage and/or Implementation of Sex Equity Vocational Education Legislation

Instructions

Briefly describe your role in the development, passage or implementation of any aspects of the legislation. Include individual and group activities and services at the national and state level. For example, involvement in getting legislation passed by Congress, developing state plan/guidelines, assistance to local agencies, providing workshops, developing coalitions, etc. Respond to those sections that apply only.

START
Turn on tape recorder and respond to the following.

---

1. How were you involved at the national level with the passage/implementation of -

   a. The Vocational Amendments of 1976?
   b. The Carl Perkins Act of 1984?

B. Involvement in Other Legislation Related to Sex Equity:

1. Were you involved in the development/passage of the following federal laws and regulations concerning sex discrimination? If so, explain.

   a. Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972:
   b. Equal Rights Restoration Act (in process):
   c. Other

C. Issues and Concerns Related to Sex Equity Legislation

(Respond to the following from a broad, global perspective)

1. What do you think were the key issues, concerns, and/or events which led to the recognition that all individuals were not receiving equitable treatment in vocational education and contributed to the passage of the Voc. Ed. Amendments of 1976 and the Carl Perkins Voc. Ed. Act of 1984?

2. What were the expectations for change and for enhancing opportunities for women in vocational education with the passage of (a) the '76 Amendments and (b) the Carl Perkins Act of 1984?

3. Were these changes realized as a result of the passage of (a) the '76 Amendments and (b) the Carl Perkins Act of 1984?

4. In your opinion, what were the most significant outcomes of (a) the '76 Amendments and (b) the Carl Perkins Act of 1984?

5. Do you think the legislative mandate to establish the Sex Equity Coordinator position in each state was necessary to insure change? Why?

6. Do you think states would have addressed the issue of sex equity in vocational education without the funds provided by the legislation? Explain.

7. What do you predict will happen in the future regarding sex equity issues and concerns in vocational education? Will we see progress or set-backs?

8. Identify any individuals, groups, or organizations who made major contributions to the development, passage, and implementation of the '76 Amendments and the Carl Perkins Act of 1984.

D. **State Level Issues:**

(Respond only if you are/were employed as a state level administrator)

1. Was there a positive or negative reaction to the emphasis given to sex equity in the legislation and to the establishment of the position of sex equity coordinator in your state?

2. Share examples of specific programs and services your state was able to offer as a result of the federal legislation on sex equity for both the '76 Amendments and the Carl Perkins Act of 1984.

3. What do you think is the most significant outcome/change in your state in the area of sex equity during the past ten years?

4. List the major barriers you and your staff encountered (or still face) in implementing the provisions of the '76 Amendments and the Carl Perkins Act of 1984?

E. **Other:**

Please feel free to add any additional comments on this topic or explore areas which were not covered on the preceding pages.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION AND ASSISTANCE

Note: Return Section I (General Information) and the tape in the postage paid envelope provided.

APPENDIX I

RESOURCES PRODUCED BY STATE SEX EQUITY PROGRAMS

ALABAMA

1978
Equal Opportunities in Vocational Education. Montgomery: Alabama State Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education.

1980
Recruiting Females for Nontraditional Vocational Education. Montgomery: Alabama State Department of Education.

ALASKA

1985
Go For It! Women Working in Construction-Related Trades in Alaska (videotape). Juneau: Alaska Department of Education.

ARIZONA

1978
Arizona: In Search of the Displaced Homemaker. Doris Woods. Tucson: University of Arizona, Displaced Homemaker Project.

1978
STEREO: Strategies, Techniques, and Effective Resources for Equalizing Opportunities--A Handbook. Arizona Department of Education. Phoenix: Arizona Curriculum Project.

1980
Opportunities and Options: A Handbook to Promote Awareness of Nontraditional Job Choices. Jenny Erwin. Arizona Department of Education: Women's Awareness of Vocational Education.

1982
Preparing for a Nontraditional Job: An Arizona Resource Directory. Virginia Brew. Flagstaff, AZ: Arizona Center for Vocational Education.

ARKANSAS

n.d.
An Assessment of Arkansas' Sex Equity Efforts in Vocational Education: Awareness, Action, Accomplishment. Little Rock: Vocational and Technical Education Division, Arkansas Department of Education.

CALIFORNIA

1986
Finding Your Place in Today's Job Market--The High-Tech Career Book. Betsy A. Collard, California.

1988
Hispana Perspectives. Maria Natera. Sacramento: CIRCLE Project, California State University.

1988
Planning A Multi-Generational, Multi-Purpose Conference for Hispanas: A Conference Model. Carlotta Curti. Sacramento: CIRCLE Project, California State University.

1989
Equity in California: Interventions. Carolyn Hadley. Sacramento: CIRCLE Project, California State University.

1989
Quality Indicators for Gender Equity and Single Parent/Homemaker Programs in California's Community Colleges. Sacramento: Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges.

COLORADO

1980
Equality in Vocational Programs--Administrative Reference. Denver: Sex Equity Section.

1985
Education and Employment: A Handbook to Promote Sex Equity. Kathryn Hollenbeck. Pueblo: Pueblo Community College.

CONNECTICUT

1980
Working Together--Sex Fairness in Business and Office Education. Hartford: Connecticut Department of Education.

1988
Gender Equity in Connecticut's Vocational Technical Schools: A Status Report, 1984-7. Linda H. Lewis, Gail O. Mellow, Christine A. Murphy, Diane Goldsmith, Dee Coover. Hartford: University of Connecticut, Vocational Equity Research Training and Evaluation Center.

DELAWARE

1980
Achieving Sex Equity in Business and Office Education. Sarah L. Bell and Carol O. Mayhew. Delaware State Board of Education. Dover: Department of Public Instruction.

1981
Resource Guide for Achieving Sex Equity in Vocational Agriculture Programs in Delaware. Dover: Delaware Department of Public Instruction, Bureau of Archives and Records.

1988
Data Analysis: Delaware Displaced Homemakers and Single Parents. Dover: Delaware Department of Labor.

1988
A Status Report on Displaced Homemakers and Single Parents in Delaware. Vikki L. Gregory. Prepared by the Displaced Homemakers Network, Washington, D.C.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

1980
Student Leaders Vocational Education Project. District of Columbia Public Schools, Division of Career Development Programs.

1982
Competency Based Curriculum--Social Studies, Sex Equity, Grades K-6. District of Columbia Public Schools.

FLORIDA

1975
The Masculine Focus in Home Economics. Judy H. Dowell and Bonnie B. Greenwood. Florida State University: School of Home Economics.

1987
ENCORE: A Pilot Project to Prepare Single Parents/Homemakers for the Job Market. Carolyn Gorton. Port Charlotte: Charlotte County Vocational Technical Center.

GEORGIA

HAWAII

1978
Sourcebook for Equal Goals in Occupations. Hawaii State Department of Education.

1984
Rainbow Shave Ice, Crackseed, and Other Ono Stuff. Sex Equity Goodies for the Classroom. Anthony Calabrese, Larry Hagmann, Sharon Freitas, Janice Shimokawa, and Berlyn C. Nishimura. Honolulu: Office of the Director for Vocational Education, Hawaii State Department of Education.

1985
Rainbow Shave Ice..Second Serving. Sex Equity Goodies for the Classroom. Honolulu: Office of the State Director for Vocational Education, University of Hawaii.

IDAHO

n.d.
Let's Get Technical (brochure). Boise: Division of Vocational Education.

ILLINOIS

n.d.
New Steps on the Career Ladder, Volume 1: Curriculum Guide. Adult, Vocational and Technical Education, Illinois State Board of Education.

1977
Sex Equity in Illinois Schools: Problems, Research, and Remedies. Springfield: Illinois Office of Education, Women's Educational Equity Task Force.

1979
Expanding Career Horizons. (kit). Adult, Vocational and Technical Education, Illinois State Board of Education.

1979
Displaced Homemakers Conference Proceedings. Springfield: Illinois State Board of Education, Department of Adult, Vocational, and Technical Education.

1980
Building Sex Equity in Vocational Education. Springfield: Illinois State Board of Education, Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education.

1980
Fair Recruitment: The Model and Strategies. Illinois State Board of Education, Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University.

1988
Building Gender Fairness in Schools. Beverly A. Stitt, Thomas L. Erekson, Richard K. Hofstrand, Franzie L. Loepp, Carole W. Minor, Heidi R. Perreault, and John G. Savage. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

INDIANA

1979
Secondary Students' Views on Occupational Sex Stereotyping and Sex Equity Resources for Vocational Educators. Diane S. Richards and JoAnn Brooks. Bloomington: Vocational Education Information Services, Indiana University.

1986
Indiana Guide to Sex Equity in Vocational Education. Michael O. Ellis. Bloomington: Vocational Education Services, Indiana University.

1988
Gender-Fair Counseling Strategies. Melissa G. Deason and Katherine L. Bolyard with Alex Smith Hall, Kenneth L. Miller, Janis B. Van Buren, and Rilyn A. Gipson. Indianapolis: Indiana Commission on Vocational-Technical Education.

1988
Single Parent and Homemaker Resource Notebook. (Revised). James A. Pershing and Jaime AnLim, editors. Bloomington: Indiana University.

1988
Working for Change: Planning a Gender Equity Workshop. Rilyn A. Gipson and Katherine L. Bolyard. Indianapolis: Indiana Commission on Vocational-Technical Education.

1988
Single Parents and Homemakers Effectiveness Study. Fred C. McCormick and Eileen R. McCormick. Indianapolis: Indiana Commission on Vocational-Technical Education.

IOWA

1980
Promoting Sex Equity in the Classroom--A Resource for Teachers of Vocational and Technical Education. Ames: Iowa State University, Department of Home Economics Education, Vocational Education Council.

1981
Multicultural Nonsexist Education. Des Moines: Department of Public Instruction.

1982
Promoting Sex Equity in the Classroom: A Bibliography. Beverly H. Larson. Des Moines: Department of Public Instruction, Educational Services Division.

KANSAS

n.d.
Sex Role Stereotyping. Microcomputer diskette. Kansas State Department of Education, Vocational Education. Pittsburg, KS: Kansas Vocational Curriculum Dissemination Center.

n.d.
The Reality of the Workingforce Today. (slide/tape set). Kansas State Department of Education with Kansas State University.

KENTUCKY

n.d.
TNT--Nontraditional Occupations. State Department of Education.

1980
How To--Strategies for Sex Equity: The Role of the Educational Administrator. C.B. Stiegler. Northern Kentucky University, Industrial and Technical Education Department.

1980
How To--Strategies for Sex Equity: The Role of the Counselor. C.B. Stiegler. Northern Kentucky University, Industrial and Technical Education Department.

1980
How To--Strategies for Sex Equity: The Role of the Vocational Teacher. C.B. Stiegler. Northern Kentucky University, Industrial and Technical Education Department.

1986
Partners in Work. Creative Nontraditional Coloring Book for Children in Child Care Programs. Joan Martin. Bowling Green: Center for Career and Vocational Teacher Education, Western Kentucky University.

LOUISIANA

n.d.
Differences That Count In Your Future. Lafayette Parish School Board.

1980
A Report on the Status of Women and Men Students and Employees in Vocational Education Programs in the State of Louisiana. Louisiana Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education.

MAINE

MARYLAND

1977
Expanding Nontraditional Opportunities in Vocational Education. Maryland State Department of Education, Division of Vocational-Technical Education.

MASSACHUSETTS

1979
Project Option: Opening People to Increasing Opportunities Now. Maureen V. Lynch. Billerica: Project OPTION.

1980
A Fair Shot/An Equal Chance: A Handbook for Vocational Students in Nontraditional Programs. Susan Riley, Billerica, MA: Project SCOPE.

1980
It's Not Funny--It's Illegal: A Handbook of Laws Guaranteeing Equal Education and Employment. Susan Riley. Billerica: Project SCOPE.

1980
It's Up to You: A Handbook for Junior High Students on Choosing Nontraditional Vocational Programs. Susan Riley, Billerica MA: Project SCOPE.

1980
Together We Can. Joan Capriole. Billerica: Project SCOPE.

1984
Future Shares: Strategies for Increasing Sex-Fair Educational Practices in Nontraditional Training Courses. (four volumes). Lexington: Massachusetts Vocational Curriculum Resource Center.

n.d.
No Laughing Matter: High School Students and Sexual Harassment (filmstrip and tape). Arlington: Bureau of Educational Technologies, State Department of Education.

MICHIGAN

1985
Hard Hats, Boots and Goggles. Sulier and Foote. Kalamazoo, MI: Center for Women's Services, Western Michigan University.

1985
Including Sex Equity in Career Education Programs: A List of Ideas for School Buildings. Lansing: Michigan State Department of Education, Office fo Sex Equity.

1985
Tune In To Your Rights--A Guide for Teenagers About Turning Off Sexual Harassment. Ann Arbor: Center for Sex Equity in Schools, University of Michigan.

MINNESOTA

n.d.
Sex Fair Counseling: Policy and Process. Minnesota Department of Education, Vocational-Technical Division.

1980
A Woman's Place--Vocational Education in Minnesota: A Technical Handbook. St. Paul: Minnesota Department of Education, Vocational-Technical Division, Minnesota Sex Equity Office.

MISSISSIPPI

1980
Sex Equity in Vocational Education--Student Manual. Jean Bond. Mississippi State Department of Education, Vocational-Technical Division. Mississippi State University, Research and Curriculum Unit.

1981
Public Relations Guide--Sex Equity in Vocational Education. Jean Bond. Mississippi State Department of Education, Vocational-Technical Division, Office for Sex Equity.

1981
Sex Equity in the Classroom--Teacher Strategies--Teacher Manual. Susan Jolly. Mississippi State Department of Education, Vocational-Technical Division. Mississippi State University, Research and Curriculum Unit.

MISSOURI

1980
Pumpkins and Possibilities: A Primer. Catherine Ann Pfeiffer. Linn Technical College, Linn, Missouri.

1981
Butcher, Baker, Candlestick Maker...A Directory of Missouri Women in Nontraditional Jobs. Karen Buckman, Linn Technical College, Women's Outreach Program.

1981
Expanding Options, a Model to Attract Secondary Students into Nontraditional Vocational Programs. James D. Good and Mary Ann DeVore. Columbia: University of Missouri, Instructional Materials Laboratory.

1981
Final Report. Linn: Linn Technical College, Women's Outreach Program.

1981
Little Bo-Peep Presents the Outreach Speech. Karen Buckman and Catherine Ann Pfeiffer. Women's Outreach Program, Linn Technical College.

1981
There Was a Couple Who Lived in a Shoe...A Brochure for Parents. Women's Outreach Program. Linn Technical College.

1982
Sexual Harassment on the Job--An Instructional Unit. Mary Ann DeVore. University of Missouri-Columbia: Instructional Materials Laboratory.

1982
Women and the Career Game--Play to Win! Ron E. Petit. University of Missouri, Columbia.

1985
Celebrate a Changing World! Cindy Fritz. Linn: Careers Unlimited/Linn Technical College.

MONTANA

NEBRASKA

NEVADA

n.d.
Equal Vocational Education--A Handbook for Educators. Carson City: Nevada Department of Education.

1989
Career Choices for Teenage Mothers (brochure). Las Vegas: Educational Equity Resource Center, University of Nevada.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

1985
Retention of Students in Vocational Programs. A Sourcebook of Strategies for High School Educators. Concord: New Hampshire State Department of Education, Division of Instructional Services.

NEW JERSEY

1977
Workshop in Providing Equal Career Opportunities. Donna Cubit-Swoyer. New Jersey Department of Education. Rutgers University, Curriculum Laboratory.

1979
Select from all Your Options--Parent Guide to Vocational Education. Shirley B. Cathie. New Jersey Education Improvement Center-Central.

1979
Select from all Your Options-Student Guide to Vocational Education. Shirley B. Cathie. New Jersey Education Improvement Center-Central.

1979
Select from all Your Options--Teacher Guide to Vocational Education. Shirley B. Cathie. New Jersey Education Improvement Center-Central.

1980
A Comprehensive Needs Assessment of Displaced Homemakers in Middlesex County. Division of Vocational Education and Career Preparation. Edison: Middlesex County College.

n.d.
Don't Say WOW! Say VOW! (brochure). Jersey City: Project VOW--Vocational Opportunities for Women, Center for Occupational Education, Jersey City State College.

NEW MEXICO

1981
New Mexico Directory of Nontraditional Workers. Santa Fe: State Board of Education.

Various Dates
Frustration Is. . .A Handbook for Managing Conflict in the Classroom
Going to Work: Job Rights for Teens
Choosing What's Best for You
Starting Out. . .A Job-Finding Handbook for Teen Parents
Winning Student Rights to Equal Education (and accompanying

teacher's guide)
Lift Off to Equal Education (and accompanying teacher's guide)
Gwendolyn's Gifts (and accompanying teacher's guide). Patty Sheehan.
All are available from the Program for Assistance in Equity, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque

NEW YORK

n.d.
Changing Labor Force--Changing Family. Project VOICE, Regional Planning Center: Albany-Schoharie-Schenectagy BOCES. Albany.

1978
Expanding Adolescent Role Expectations, Information, Activities, Resources for Vocational Educators. New York State College of Human Ecology. Ithaca: Media Services Printing.

1978
Sex Equality in Self Views--In School Practices--In Career Counseling: Leader's Guide. Deanna Chitayat, Harvey Lieberman, and Judith Waters. New York: State University of New York.

1979
The Displaced Homemaker in New York State: A Needs Assessment. Albany: New York State University.

1980
Move On Together: Classroom Activities for Vocational Education. Utica: Project MOVE, SUNY-Utica.

1981
Project SEISMIC--Sex Equity in Schools--Modules in Careers: Community Outreach Guide. Deanna Chitayat. New York: State University of New York.

1981
Project SEISMIC--Sex Equity in Schools--Modules in Careers: Curriculum Guide. Deanna Chitayat. New York: State University of New York.

1981
Project SEISMIC--Sex Equity in Schools--Modules in Careers: Staff Development Guide. Deanna Chitayat. New York: State University of New York.

NORTH CAROLINA

1980
Annual Status Report on Male and Female Students and Employees In Vocational Education. Linda Schnulle Dillon and Gary Ridout. North Carolina State University, Vocational Education.

1982
A Model to Increase Nontraditional Enrollment in the Community and Technical Colleges of North Carolina: Final Report. Department of Community Colleges. Raleigh: North Carolina State University.

1983
Sexual Pressures on Vocational Educators in the Southern Region. Maynard J. Iverson. Raleigh: North Carolina State University.

NORTH DAKOTA

1979
Displaced Homemakers in North Dakota. North Dakota State Board for Vocational Education: Research Coordination Unit.

1989
Nontraditional Occupations. Bismarck: Governor's Employment and Training Forum.

OHIO

1986
Breaking the Chain of Stereotyping. Building Student Awareness of the Effects of Sex-Role Stereotyping (Grades 7-12). H. Eugene Wysong. Columbus: Division of Vocational and Career Education, Ohio Department of Education.

1986
Sex Fair Artwork--A Sourcebook of Reproducible Line Art. Columbus: Center for Sex Equity, IML, Ohio State University.

1987
Career Choices in Vocational Education: Is This Job for Me? (videotape). Columbus: Ohio Department of Education, Division of Vocational and Career Education.

OKLAHOMA

1978
Eliminating Sex Bias and Sex-Role Stereotyping from Instructional Materials. Sarah H. Mussett. Stillwater: Curriculum and Instructional Materials Center.

1981
Educational Equity: Teaching, Learning and Achieving. Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical Education. Stillwater: Curriculum and Instructional Materials Center.

1981
Time For a Change: A Woman's Guide to Nontraditional Occupations. Constance D. Cauley. Tulsa, OK: Ellis Associates, Inc.

OREGON

1982
Mathematics in Vocational Education. Lebannon Union High School, Oregon State University, Vocational-Technical Education Department.

PENNSYLVANIA

1980
Women on the Move: A Counseling Workshop Manual for Women Seeking Nontraditional Work. Priscilla H. Farmer. Harrisburg: Pennsylvania Department of Education.

1982
Things Are Not Always as They Seem--A Module for Pre-Service Vocation. M. Eloise Murray, Dennis Appert, and Virginia Clark. Harrisburg: Vocational Equity Department.

1983
Home Entrepreneurship: Instructional Materials in the Operation of a Small Business from the Home. Susan F. Weis and Kay S. O'Brien. Pennsylvania.

1986
Nontraditional Career Awareness. Monroeville: Forbes Road East Area Vocational Technical School.

PUERTO RICO

RHODE ISLAND

SOUTH CAROLINA

1982
Pathways to Sex Equity: A Training Module for Promoting Sex Equity in Vocational Education. Columbia: Department of Education.

SOUTH DAKOTA

1989
Videotapes for elementary schools. State Department of Education.

TENNESSEE

TEXAS

1983
A Manual for Post-secondary Displaced Homemaker Programs. Maureen Dahlberg. Killeen: Central Texas College.

1984
Forum for Change. An Articulation Workshop for Secondary and Post-secondary Educators to Promote Equal Access in Vocational Education. Corpus Christi: Education Service Center Region 2.

1984
Series of four reports from Yleta Independent School District: Developing a Mentor-Protege Program. Job-visitation Activity. Mary Lou Rosales and Armenia Smith. Developing a Role-Model Index. A Guide Book. Eva Ross and Armenia Smith. Linking Education and Industry in Preparing Students for Nontraditional Jobs: Project Model. Armenia Smith. Sex Equity. Keeping the Drive Alive: A Guide to Promoting Sex Equity in Your School District. Armenia Smith. El Paso: Ysleta Independent School District.

UTAH

n.d.
Project VOTE: Career Conversations, Equity Ideas, Looking Out for Life, Opening Doors, Support Yourself, Equity Indicator List. Salt Lake City: Utah State Board of Vocational Education.

1982
Careers Unlimited. Salt Lake City: Utah State Office of Education.

1987
Single Parent or Displaced Homemaker Program Management Guide. Salt Lake City: Utah State Office of Education, Division of Vocational Education.

VERMONT

n.d.
Killing Us Both (slides/commentary). Montpelier: Vermont Department of Education.

n.d.
More Women Are Choosing Nontraditional Careers. Why Not You? (brochure). Montpelier: Vocational Sex Equity, Vermont Department of Education.

VIRGINIA

n.d.
It's Not a Sugar 'n Spice World Out There (brochure). Richmond: Vocational Sex Equity, Virginia Department of Education.

1988
Innovative Practices and Developments in Vocational Sex Equity. Ervin V. Griffin and Linnea Olson, Editors. Richmond: Virginia Department of Education.

WASHINGTON

1977
Vocational Orientation Course for Displaced Homemakers: Instructor's Manual. Washington State Commission for Vocational Education. Bellevue Community College: Women's Center.

WEST VIRGINIA

1980
Directory of Nontraditional Workers in West Virginia. Martha A. McConnell. Grafton, WV: Taylor County Vocational Center.

WISCONSIN

1977
Trainer's Guide: Freedon For Individual Development. Barbara A. Bitters. Madison: Department of Public Instruction.

1977
Vocational Education. Roberta Gassman and Fredda Merson. Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction.

1979
New Horizons--Women's Centers in the VTAE System. Dolores Arnold Grengg. Madison: Wisconsin Board of Education.

1983
Maximizing Options for Students in Business. Nancy Deutsch, Roberta Gassman, and Lonnie Weiss. Madison: Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, Bureau of Vocational Education.

1988
Classroom Activities in Sex Equity for Developmental Guidance. Madison: Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction.

WYOMING

APPENDIX J

TITLE IX REGULATIONS (56)

- Sec. 106.3 -- Remedial and affirmative action and self evaluation.

  This part requires that by July 1976 each institution receiving Federal funds (recipient) should have evaluated its current policies and practices and their effects for discrimination on the basis of sex. Policies and practices that did not meet the Title IX requirements should have been modified and a description of steps then taken should have been maintained by the institution for at least three years. This part also allows but does not require a recipient to take affirmative steps to overcome the effects of conditions which limited participation by persons of one sex or the other.

- Sec. 106.8 -- Designation of responsible employee and adoption of grievance procedures.

  Each recipient must designate at least one employee to coordinate Title IX efforts and activities, including investigation of complaints. The recipient must also adopt and publish grievance procedures to provide for prompt and equitable resolution of complaints.

- Sec. 106.9 -- Dissemination of policy.

  Each recipient must take specific and continuing steps to notify applicants for admission and employment, students and parents of elementary and secondary school students, employees, sources of referral of applicants for admission and employment, and all unions or professional organizations holding collective bargaining or professional agreements with the recipient, that it does not discriminate on the basis of sex. This information should have been made three months after these regulations became applicable to the recipient and should have appeared in local newspapers, newspapers or other media operated by the recipient, and in other communications distributed to students and employees.

  Also, a statement of policy must be included in all written materials made available by the recipient to students and employees. Publications that suggest by either text or illust-ation that one sex is treated differently on the basis of sex (with a few exceptions) are prohibited. This prohibition does not cover texts or curricular materials.

- Sec. 106.21 -- Admission.

  No person shall be denied admission or be subjected to discrimination in admission to covered institutions on the basis of sex. Specific prohibitions in this section include use of numerical limitations and biased tests which favor one sex or the other. This part also prohibits admission policies that discriminate on the basis of marital or parental status. (Private undergraduate institutions, public single sex institutions, and elementary and secondary schools may restrict admissions on the basis of sex. Those students who are admitted to such schools, however, may not be treated differently on the basis of sex.)

- Sec. 106.23 -- Recruitment.

  A recipient may not discriminate on the basis of sex in recruiting and admitting students.

- Sec. 106.31 -- Education programs and activities.

  A recipient may not exclude or deny benefits, on the basis of sex, to persons in any academic, extracurricular, research, occupational training, or any other program which receives Federal assistance. Specific examples of this prohibition are contained in this part of the regulation.

- Sec. 106.32 -- Housing.

  A recipient may not, on the basis of sex, apply different rules, regulations, or impose different fees or requirements in practices and policies relating to housing. Housing, when provided to students of one sex, must be comparable to that which is provided to students of the other sex.

- Sec. 106.33 -- Comparable facilities.

  Facilities such as locker rooms and showers provided for students of one sex must be comparable to facilities provided for students of the other sex.

- Sec. 106.34 -- Access to course offerings.

  A recipient may not provide courses or other educational activities separately on the basis of sex, including health, physical education, industrial, business, vocational, technical, home economics, music (with certain exceptions), and adult education courses. This section does not prohibit separation of students by sex in classes or activities involving wrestling, boxing, rugby, ice hockey, football, basketball, or other sports which involve bodily contact. Sex education courses also may be conducted separately.

- Sec. 106.35 -- Access to schools operated by local educational agencies.

  A recipient which is a local education agency may not exclude, on the basis of sex, any person from admission to a vocational education institution or any other school or unit operated by the recipient.

- Sec. 106.36 -- Counseling and use of appraisal and counseling materials.

  A recipient may not use appraisal and counseling materials or methods that discriminate on the basis of sex. A recipient is required to develop procedures to assure that materials are sex fair. In addition, recipients are required to take steps to assure that any disproportion in the numbers of males and females in classes is not due to discrimination on the basis of sex in counseling materials or practices.

- Sec.106.37 -- Financial assistance.

  Financial assistance to students may not be awarded on the basis of sex, with certain exceptions which are detailed in this section.

- Sec. 106.38 -- Employment assistance.

  A recipient may not discriminate on the basis of sex in making employment available to its students.

- Sec. 106.39 -- Health and insurance benefits and services.

  A recipient may not discriminate on the basis of sex in providing health and insurance benefits and services.

- Sec. 106.40 -- Marital or parental status.

  A recipient may not apply rules relating to parental, family, or marital status which treat students differently on the basis of sex. Pregnancy is to be treated as any other temporary disability.

- Sec. 106.41 -- Athletics.

  No person, on the basis of sex, may be excluded from participation in, be denied benefits of, or be discriminated against in any interscholastic, intercollegiate, club, or intramural athletics. In 1979, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare issued a policy interpretation which provides specific guidance and a statement of institutional responsibilities as they apply to intercollegiate, club, and intramural athletic programs.

- Sec. 106.51-106.60 -- Employment.

  Discrimination on the basis of sex is prohibited in employment as well as employee recruitment and selection. The provisions apply to advertising, upgrading, promotion, tenure, lay off, termination, rates of pay, job classification, collective bargaining, leave, fringe benefits, financial support for training, pre-employment inquiries, marital or parental status, and employer sponsored activities.

APPENDIX K

THE EDUCATIONAL AMENDMENTS OF 1976 (21)*

Title II -- Vocational Education

I. PURPOSE. Statement of purpose for authorization of Federal grants to States, including the purpose of overcoming sex discrimination and stereotyping in vocational education, Section 101 (3):

It is also the purpose of this part to authorize Federal grants to States to assist them--

> To develop and carry out such programs of vocational education within each State so as to overcome sex discrimination and sex stereotyping in vocational education programs (including programs of homemaking), and thereby furnish equal educational opportunities in vocational education to persons of both sexes.

Regulation #104.2 (3):

> Purpose.
> To develop and carry out such programs of vocational education within each State so as to overcome sex discrimination and sex stereotyping in vocational education programs (including programs of homemaking) and thereby furnish equal educational opportunities in vocational education to persons of both sexes.

II. STATE PERSONNEL. Assignment of full-time personnel by participating States to assist in fulfilling the purposes of the Act (Section 104(b)(1)), functions of personnel A-I, funding (2):

"(1) Any State desiring to participate in the programs authorized by this Act shall also assign such full-time personnel as may be necessary to assist the State board in fulfilling the purposes of this Act by--

> "(A) taking such action as may be necessary to create awareness of programs and activities in vocational education that are designed to reduce sex stereotyping in all vocational education programs;

---

* Pgs. 189-205 Excerpts from the Law

"(B) gathering, analyzing, and disseminating data on the status of men and women students and employees in the vocational education programs of that State;

"(C) developing and supporting actions to correct any problems brought to the attention of such personnel through activities carried out under clause (B) of this sentence;

"(D) reviewing the distribution of grants by the State Board to assure that the interests and needs of women are addressed in the projects assisted under this Act;

"(E) reviewing all vocational education programs in the State for sex bias;

"(F) monitoring the implementation of laws prohibiting sex discrimination in all hiring, firing, and promotion procedures within the State relating to vocational education;

"(G) reviewing and submitting recommendations with respect to the overcoming of sex stereotyping and sex bias in vocational education programs for the annual program plan and report;

"(H) assisting local educational agencies and other interested parties in the State in improving vocational education opportunities for women; and

"(I) making readily available to the State Board, the State and National Advisory Councils on Vocational Education, and State Commission on the Status of Women, the Commissioner and the general public, information developed pursuant to this subsection."

"(2) From the funds appropriated to carry out subpart 2, each State shall reserve $50,000 in each fiscal year to carry out this subsection.

III. STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL. State Advisory Council make-up, Section 105(a)

(2)(17):

"Section 105(a)(2). Each State Advisory Council shall have as a majority of its members persons who are not educators or administrators in the field of education and shall include as members one or more individuals who--

"(17) are women with backgrounds and experiences in employment and training programs, and who are knowledgeable with respect to the special experiences and problems of sex discrimination in job training and employment and of sex stereotyping in vocational education, including women who are members of minority groups and who have in addition to such backgrounds and experiences, special knowledge of the problems of discrimination in job training and employment against women who are members of such groups;

. . . Governor or the State Board of Education . . . shall insure that there is appropriate representation of both sexes . . . .

IV. FIVE YEAR STATE PLAN. The five year State plan, Section 107(b)(4): "Section

107

> "(b) The five year State plans shall be submitted to the Commissioner by July 1st preceding the beginning of the first fiscal year for which such plan is to take effect and shall--
>
> > "(4)(A) set forth policies and procedures which the State will follow so as to assure equal access to vocational education programs by both women and men including--
> >
> > > "(i) a detailed description of such policies and procedures,
> > >
> > > "(ii) actions to be taken to overcome sex discrimination and sex stereotyping in all State and local vocational education programs, and
> > >
> > > "(iii) incentives, to be provided to eligible recipients so that such recipients will--
> > >
> > > > "(I) encourage the enrollment of both women and men in nontraditional courses of study, and

"Section 109(a)(3)(B)

> "(B) In carrying out the provisions of this subsection, the Commissioner shall not approve a State plan or annual program plan and report until he has received assurances that the personnel assigned to review programs within the State to assure equal access by both men and women under the provisions of section 104(b) have been afforded the opportunity to review the plan or program plan and report.

V. USE OF FUNDS. Authorization of grants and uses of funds, Section

120(b)(1)(F)(J)(K)(L):

Note: F -- full-time personnel
J -- support services for women in nontraditional jobs;
counseling
job development
K -- day care for children
L -- vocational education for displaced homemakers

"Section 120(b)(1) Grants to States under this subpart may be used, in accordance with five-year State plans and annual program plans approved pursuant to section 109, for the following purposes:

> "(F) support of full-time personnel to perform the duties described in section 104(b);
>
> "(J) support services for women who enter programs designed to prepare individuals for employment in jobs which have been traditionally limited to men, including counseling as to the nature of such programs and the difficulties which may be encountered by women in such programs, and job development and job follow-up services;
>
> "(K) day care services for children of students in secondary and post-secondary vocational education programs;
>
> "(L) vocational education for --
>
>> "(i) persons who had solely been homemakers but who now, because of dissolution of marriage, must seek employment;
>>
>> "(ii) persons who are single heads of households and who lack adequate job skills;
>>
>> "(iii) persons who are currently homemakers and part-time workers but who wish to secure a full-time job; and
>>
>> "(iv) women who are now in jobs which have been traditionally considered jobs for females and who wish to seek employment in job areas which have not been traditionally considered job areas for females, and men who are now in jobs which have been traditionally considered jobs for males and who wish to seek employment in job areas which have not been traditionally considered job areas for males."

104.502 Use of funds under the basic grant.

(c) The State may use the balance of the funds available under the basic grant (section 120 of the Act), in accordance with the approved five-year State plan and annual program plan, for any of the following purposes:

(9) Support services for women, described in 104.611;

(10) Day care services for children of students in secondary and postsecondary vocational education programs, described in 104.611.

Support Services for Women
104.601 Use of funds.
A State may use funds under its basic grant (section 120 of the Act), when included in its approved five-year State plan and annual program plan, for support services for women who enter vocational education programs designed to prepare individuals for employment in jobs which have been traditionally limited to men.

104.602 Types of support services.
Support services to be provided under 104.601 include:

(a) Counseling. Counseling women entering and enrolled in non-traditional programs on the nature of these programs and on the ways of overcoming the difficulties which may be encountered by women in these programs. Counselors may furnish supportive services to assist students in adjusting to the new employment requirements.

(b) Job development. Programs and activities in the area of job development include the provision of materials and information concerning the world of work which present women students entering, enrolled in, or interested in nontraditional programs, the options, opportunities, and range of jobs available in these nontraditional fields. Job development support services may also be carried out through bringing persons employed in these nontraditional fields into the schools, as well as providing opportunities for women students to visit the workplace of business and industry so as to afford them a clear understanding of the nature of the work, including an understanding of the work setting in which these jobs are performed.

(c) Job follow-up support. Support services may be provided to assist women students in finding employment relevant to their training and interests. Follow-up services may be provided to assist students in the work force, and dealing with barriers which women face in working in these nontraditional areas.

104.603 Support to increase number of women instructors.
In funding programs and activities of support services for women, funds may be used to increase the number of women instructors involved in the training of individuals in programs which have traditionally enrolled mostly males, so as to provide supportive examples for these women who are preparing for jobs in these nontraditional areas of employment.

Day Care Services for Children of Students

104.611 Use of Funds.
A State may use funds under its basic grant (section 120 of the Act), when included in the approved five-year State plan and annual program plan, to provide day care services for children of students (both male and female and including single parents) in secondary and postsecondary vocational education programs.

104.612 Day care services.

(a) Day care services shall be for the purpose of providing appropriate care and protection of infants, pre-school and school-age children in order to afford students who are parents the opportunity to participate in vocational education programs.

(b) The day care services provided under this section shall be governed by the Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements (45 CFR Part 71).

Vocational Education Programs for Displaced Homemakers and Other Special Groups

104.621 Use of Funds.
A State shall use funds under its basic grant (section 120 of the Act) in accordance with its approved five-year State plan and annual program plan to provide vocational education programs for the following special groups:

(a) Persons who had been homemakers but who now, because of dissolution of marriage, must seek employment;

(b) Persons who are single heads of households and who lack adequate job skills;

(c) Persons who are currently homemakers and part-time workers but who wish to secure a full-time job; and

(d) Women who are now in jobs which have been traditionally considered jobs for females and who wish to seek employment in job areas which have not been traditionally considered jobs for males and who wish to seek employment in job areas which have not been traditionally considered as job areas for males.

104.622 Scope of programs.
The State shall fund programs, in accordance with the policies and procedures described in its approved five-year State plan pursuant to 104.187(b), to assess and meet the needs of the groups described in 104.621. These programs shall include:

> (a) Organized educational programs necessary to prepare these special groups for employment, including the acquisition, maintenance and repair of instructional equipment;
>
> (b) Special courses preparing these individuals in how to seek employment; and
>
> (c) Provision of placement service for the graduate of these programs.

VI. PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT; EXEMPLARY AND INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS.

Funds available to State for program improvement, Section 131(a)(2)(3)(5); State funds for contracts for exemplary and innovative programs, Section 132(b).

"Section 131. (a) Funds available to the States under section 130(a) may be used for support of State research coordination units and for contracts by those units pursuant to comprehensive plans of program improvement involving--

> "(2) experimental, developmental, and pilot programs and projects designed to test the effectiveness of research findings, including programs and projects to overcome problems of sex bias and sex stereotyping;
>
> "(3) improved curriculum materials for presently funded programs in vocational education and new curriculum materials for new and emerging job fields, including a review and revision of any curricula developed under this section to insure that such curricula do not reflect stereotypes based on sex, race, or national origin;
>
> "(5) dissemination of the results of the contracts made pursuant to paragraphs (1) through (4), including employment of persons to act as disseminators, on a local level, of these results.

"Section 132. (b) Every contract made by a State for the purpose of funding exemplary and innovative projects shall give priority to programs and projects designed to reduce sex stereotyping in vocational education and shall, to the extent consistent with the number of students enrolled in nonprofit private schools in the area to be served whose educational needs are of the type which the program or project involved is to meet, provide for the participation of such students; and such contract shall also provide that the Federal funds will not be commingled with State or local funds."

VII. CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT TO OVERCOME SEX BIAS AND STEREOTYPING. State funds for contracts to support curriculum development projects, Section 133(a)(2) (specifically to overcome sex bias and stereotyping in educational, counseling and testing materials):

"Section 133(a). Funds available to the States under section 130(a) may be used for contracts for the support of curriculum development projects, including--

"(2) the development of curriculum and guidance and testing materials designed to overcome sex bias in vocational education programs, and support services designed to enable teachers to meet the needs of individuals enrolled in vocational education programs traditionally limited to members of the opposite sex.

VIII. VOCATIONAL GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING. Vocational guidance and counseling, Section 134(a), funding; Section 134(a)(4)(A)(B)(C), counselor training:

"Section 134. (a) Not less than 20 per centum of the funds available to the States under section 130(a) shall be used to support programs for vocational development guidance and counseling programs and services which, subject to the provisions of subsection (b), shall include--

"(4) vocational guidance and counseling training designed to acquaint guidance counselors with (A) the changing work patterns of women, (B) ways of effectively overcoming occupational sex stereotyping, and (C) ways of assisting girls and women in selecting careers solely on their occupational needs and interests, and to develop improved career materials which are free.

IX. TRAINING FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PERSONNEL. State funds for training of vocational education personnel, Section 135(a)(2), inservice to overcome sex bias, etc.:

"Section 135. (a) Funds available to the States under section 130(a) may be used to support programs or projects designed to improve the qualifications of persons serving or preparing to serve in vocational education programs, including teachers, administrators, supervisors, and vocational guidance and counseling personnel, including programs or projects--

"(2) which provide in-service training for vocational education teachers and other staff members, to improve the quality of instruction supervision, and administration of vocational education programs, and to overcome sex bias in vocational education programs.

X. CONSUMER AND HOMEMAKING EDUCATION. Grants to States for consumer and homemaking education, Section 150(b)(A)(B)(C):

"Section 150. (b) Grants to States under this subpart may be used, in accordance with five-year State plans and annual program plans approved pursuant to section 109, solely for (1) educational programs, services, and activities at all educational levels for the occupations of homemaking including but not limited to, consumer education, food and nutrition, family living and parenthood education, child development and guidance, housing and home management (including resource management), and clothing and textiles which (A) encourage participation of both males and females to prepare for combining the roles of homemakers and wage earners; (B) encourage elimination of sex stereotyping in consumer and homemaking education by promoting the development of curriculum materials which deal (i) with increased numbers of women working outside the home, and increased numbers of men assuming homemaking responsibilities and the changing career patterns for women and men and (ii) with appropriate Federal and State laws relating to equal opportunity in education and employment; (E) prepare males and females who have entered or are preparing to enter the work of the home.

XI. NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP. Establishment of National Advisory Council with female membership insured, Section 162(a)(6):

"Section 162. (a) The National Advisory Council on Vocational Education, established pursuant to section 104(a) of the Vocational Education Act of 1963, in effect prior to the enactment of the Education Amendments of 1976, shall continue to exist during the period for which appropriations are authorized under this Act. Individuals who are members of the Council on the date of the enactment of this Act may continue to serve for the terms for which they were appointed. Members appointed to succeed such individuals shall be appointed by the President for terms of three years. The Council shall consist of twenty-one members, each of whom shall be designated as representing one of the categories set forth in the following sentence. The National Advisory Council shall include individuals--

> "(6) who are women with backgrounds and experiences in employment and training programs, who are knowledgeable with respect to problems of sex discrimination in job training and in employment, including women who are

> members of minority groups and who have, in addition to such backgrounds and experiences, special knowledge of the problems of discrimination in job training and employment against women who are members of such groups;"

In appointing the National Advisory Council, the President shall insure that there is appropriate representation of both sexes, racial and ethnic minorities, and the various geographic regions of the country.

XII. GRANT AUTHORIZATION. Authorization of grants and uses of funds, Section 130(b)(6):

> "Section 130. (b) Grants to States under this subpart may be used, in accordance with five-year State plans, and annual program plans approved pursuant to Section 109, for the following purposes:
>
> "(6) grants to overcome sex bias as described in Section 136."

XIII. NATIONAL PROGRAMS. Programs of national significance, Section 171(a)(1):

> "Section 171. (a) Funds reserved to the Commissioner under Section 103 for programs under this part shall be used primarily for contracts, and in some cases for grants, for--
>
> "(1) activities authorized by sections 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, and 136, if such activities are deemed to be of national significance by the Commissioner . . .

XIII. STUDY OF SEX DISCRIMINATION AND STEREOTYPING IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION. Studies of Vocational Education; Section 523--Requires Commissioner of Education to study extent to which sex discrimination and stereotyping have been eliminated under the Vocational Education Act of 1963, Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973 and the Education Amendments of 1972.

> Studies of Vocational Education
> Section 523. (a) The Commissioner of Education shall carry out a study of the extent to which sex discrimination and sex stereotyping exist in all vocational education

programs assisted under the Vocational Education Act of 1963, and of the progress that has been made to reduce or eliminate such discrimination and stereotyping in such programs and in the occupations for which such programs prepare students. The Commissioner shall report the results of such study, together with any recommendations with respect thereto, to the Congress within two years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b)(1) In addition to the other authorities, responsibilities, and duties conferred upon the National Institute of Education (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Institute") by Section 405 of the General Education Provisions Act, as amended by this Act, the Institute shall undertake a thorough evaluation and study of vocational education programs, including such programs conducted by the States, and such programs conducted under the Vocational Education Act of 1963 and other related programs conducted under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973 and by the State Post-Secondary Commissions authorized by the Education Amendments of 1972. Such a study shall include--

(A) a study of the distribution of vocational education funds in terms of services, occupations, target populations, enrollments, and educational and governmental levels and what such distribution should be in order to meet the greatest human resource needs for the next 10 years;

(B) an examination of how to achieve compliance with, and enforcement of, the provisions of applicable laws of the United States;

(C) an analysis of the means of assessing program quality and effectiveness;

(D) depending on the level of funding available to the Institute, not more than three experimental studies to be administered by the Institute, in cases where the INstitute determines that such experimental programs are necessary to carry out the purpose of clauses (A) through (C) and the Commissioner of Education and the Secretary of Labor are authorized, notwithstanding any provision of any other law, at the request of the Institute, to approve the use of grants which educational or other agencies are eligible to receive under such Acts (in cases where such agencies agree to the uses of such grants), in order to carry out such experimental programs;

(E) fundings and recommendations, including recommendations for changes in such Acts or for new legislation, with respect to the matters studies under clauses (A) through (E); and

(F) a review and evaluation of the effectiveness of programs funded under subpart 5 of part A of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (as such Act is in effect on October 1, 1977), and to make recommendations for the redirection and the improvement of programs at all levels under such subpart.

(2) The Institute shall make an interim report to the President and to the Congress not later than September 30, 1979, and shall make a final report to the President and to the Congress no later than September 30, 1980, on the result of its study conducted under this section, except that the report required pursuant to paragraph (1) (f) shall be transmitted to the President and the Congress not later than January 15, 1979. Any other provision of law, rule, or regulation to the contrary notwithstanding, such reports shall not be submitted to any review outside of the Institute before their transmittal to the Congress, but the President and the Commissioner may make to the Congress such recommendations with respect to the content of the reports as each may deem appropriate.

(3) Sums made available pursuant to Section 102 of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (as such Act is in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act) and sections 102 and 103 of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (as such Act is in effect on October 1, 1977) shall be available to carry out the administrative and direct cost requirements of the provisions of this section. These funds shall not exceed $1,000,000 per year for each of the fiscal years ending prior to October 1, 1979. Ten per centum of the funds made available under this section shall be made available for purposes of carrying out the provisions of paragraph (1)(F).

(4)(A) The Institute shall submit to the Congress, within 10 months after the date appropriations become available to carry out this section, a plan for the study to be conducted under this section. The Institute shall not commence such study until the first day after the close of the first period of 30 calendar days of continuous session of the Congress after the date of the delivery of such plan to the Congress.

(B) For purposes of subparagraph (A)--

(i) continuity of session is broken only by an adjournment of the Congress sine die; and

(ii) the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 30 days to a day certain are excluded in the computation of the 30-day period.

APPENDIX L

CARL D. PERKINS ACT OF 1984 - EXCERPTS FROM THE LAW

Selected[1] Sections of Carl D. Perkins Act of 1984.

Public Law 98-524
98th Congress

An Act

To amend the Vocational Education Act of 1963 to strengthen and expand the economic base of the Nation, develop human resources, reduce structural unemployment, increase productivity, and strengthen the Nation's defense capabilities by assisting the States to expand, improve, and update high-quality programs of vocational technical education, and for other purposes.

Oct. 19, 1984
[H.R. 4164]

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of December 18, 1963 (Public Law 88-210) is amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act.
20 USC 2301 note.

"SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS

"SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the 'Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act'.

"TABLE OF CONTENTS

"Sec. 1. Short title.
"Sec. 2. Statement of purpose.
"Sec. 3. Authorization of appropriations.

"TITLE I—VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ASSISTANCE TO THE STATES

"PART A—ALLOTMENT AND ALLOCATION

"Sec. 101. Allotment.
"Sec. 102. Within State allocation.
"Sec. 103. Indian and Hawaiian native programs.

"PART B—STATE ORGANIZATIONAL AND PLANNING RESPONSIBILITIES

"Sec. 111. State administration.
"Sec. 112. State council on vocational education.
"Sec. 113. State plans.
"Sec. 114. Approval.
"Sec. 115. Local application.

"TITLE II—BASIC STATE GRANTS FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

"PART A—VOCATIONAL EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES

"Sec. 201. Uses of funds.
"Sec. 202. Distribution of assistance.
"Sec. 203. Within State allocation.
"Sec. 204. Criteria for services and activities for the handicapped and for the disadvantaged.

"PART B—VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT, INNOVATION, AND EXPANSION

"Sec. 251. Uses of funds.
"Sec. 252. Criteria for program improvement, innovation, and expansion.

"TITLE III—SPECIAL PROGRAMS

"PART A—STATE ASSISTANCE FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION SUPPORT PROGRAMS BY COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATIONS

"Sec. 301. Applications.
"Sec. 302. Uses of funds.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY—H.R. 4164 (S. 2341):

HOUSE REPORTS: No. 98-612 (Comm. on Education and Labor) and No. 98-1129 (Comm. of Conference).
SENATE REPORT No. 98-507 accompanying S. 2341 (Comm. on Labor and Human Resources).
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Vol. 130 (1984):
Mar. 7, 8, considered and passed House.
Aug. 8, considered and passed Senate, amended, in lieu of S. 2341.
Oct. 3, Senate agreed to conference report.
Oct. 4, House agreed to conference report.

"PART B—DEFINITIONS

"Sec. 521. Definitions.

"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this Act to—

"(1) assist the States to expand, improve, modernize, and develop quality vocational education programs in order to meet the needs of the Nation's existing and future work force for marketable skills and to improve productivity and promote economic growth;

*"(2) assure that individuals who are inadequately served under vocational education programs are assured access to quality vocational education programs, especially individuals who are disadvantaged, who are handicapped, men and women who are entering nontraditional occupations, adults who are in need of training and retraining, individuals who are single parents or homemakers, individuals with limited English proficiency, and individuals who are incarcerated in correctional institutions;

"(3) promote greater cooperation between public agencies and the private sector in preparing individuals for employment, in promoting the quality of vocational education in the States, and in making the vocational system more responsive to the labor market in the States;

"(4) improve the academic foundations of vocational students and to aid in the application of newer technologies (including the use of computers) in terms of employment or occupational goals;

"(5) provide vocational education services to train, retrain, and upgrade employed and unemployed workers in new skills for which there is a demand in that State or employment market;

"(6) assist the most economically depressed areas of a State to raise employment and occupational competencies of its citizens;

"(7) to assist the State to utilize a full range of supportive services, special programs, and guidance counseling and placement to achieve the basic purposes of this Act;

*"(8) improve the effectiveness of consumer and homemaking education and to reduce the limiting effects of sex-role stereotyping on occupations, job skills, levels of competency, and careers; and

"(9) authorize national programs designed to meet designated vocational education needs and to strengthen the vocational education research process.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 3. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated $835,300,000 for the fiscal year 1985 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1986 through 1989 to carry out the provisions of titles I (other than section 112), II, and IV (other than part E) of this Act.

"(b)(1) There are authorized to be appropriated $15,000,000 for the fiscal year 1985 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1986 through 1989 to carry out part A of title III istration or the supervision of the State vocational education program. The responsibilities of the State board shall include—

"(A) coordination of the development, submission, and implementation of the State plan, and the evaluation of the program, services, and activities assisted under this Act pursuant to section 113(b)(9); and

Ante, p. 2436.
Post, p. 2445.

"(B) the development, in consultation with the State council on vocational education, and the submission to the Secretary, of the State plan required by section 113 and by section 114;

Post, p. 2449.

"(C) consultation with the State council established pursuant to section 112, and other appropriate agencies, groups, and individuals involved in the planning, administration, evaluation, and coordination of programs funded under this Act;

Post, p. 2443.

"(D) convening and meeting as a State board (consistent with State law and procedure for the conduct of such meetings) at such time as the State board determines necessary to carry out its functions under this Act, but not less than four times annually; and

"(E) the adoption of such procedures as the State board considers necessary to implement State level coordination with the State job training coordinating council to encourage cooperation in the conduct of their respective programs.

Except with respect to the functions set forth in the preceding sentence, the State board may delegate any of its other responsibilities involving administration, operation, or supervision, in whole or in part, to one or more appropriate State agencies.

"(2) Each State shall include a description of any delegation of its functions under paragraph (1) in its State plan, or amendments to such plan, submitted to the Secretary.

Women

"(b)(1) Any State desiring to participate in the programs authorized by this Act shall assign one individual within the appropriate agency established or designated by the State board under the last sentence of subsection (a)(1) to administer vocational education programs within the State, to work full time to assist the State board to fulfill the purposes of this Act by—

Post, p. 2450.

"(A) administering the program of vocational education for single parents and homemakers described in section 201(f) and the sex equity program described in section 201(g);

"(B) gathering, analyzing, and disseminating data on the adequacy and effectiveness of vocational education programs in the State in meeting the education and employment needs of women (including preparation for employment in technical occupations, new and emerging occupational fields, and occupations regarded as nontraditional for women), and on the status of men and women students and employees in such programs;

"(C) reviewing vocational education programs (including career guidance and counseling) for sex stereotyping and sex bias, with particular attention to practices which tend to inhibit the entry of women in high technology occupations, and submitting (i) recommendations for inclusion in the State plan of programs and policies to overcome sex bias and sex stereotyping in such programs, and (ii) an assessment of the State's progress in meeting the purposes of this Act with regard to overcoming sex discrimination and sex stereotyping;

"(D) reviewing proposed actions on grants, contracts, and the policies of the State board to ensure that the needs of women are addressed in the administration of this Act;

"(E) developing recommendations for programs of information and outreach to women concerning vocational education and employment opportunities for women (including opportunities for careers as technicians and skilled workers in technical fields and new and emerging occupational fields);

"(F) providing technical assistance and advice to local educational agencies, postsecondary institutions, and other interested parties in the State, in expanding vocational opportunities for women; and

"(G) assisting administrators, instructors, and counselors in implementing programs and activities to increase access for women (including displaced homemakers and single heads of households) to vocational education and to increase male and female students' enrollment in nontraditional programs.

"(2) For the purpose of this subsection, the term 'State' means any one of the fifty States and the District of Columbia.

"(3) Each State shall expend not less than $60,000 in each fiscal year to carry out the provisions of this subsection.

"(c) The State board shall make available to each private industry council established under section 102 of the Job Training Partnership Act within the State a listing of all programs assisted under this Act.

29 USC 1512.
Ante, p. 2435.

"(d) Each State board, in consultation with the State council, shall establish a limited number of technical committees to advise the council and the board on the development of model curricula to address State labor market needs. Technical committees shall develop an inventory of skills that may be used by the State board to define state-of-the-art model curricula. Such inventory will provide the type and level of knowledge and skills needed for entry, retention, and advancement in occupational areas taught in the State. The State board shall establish procedures for membership, operation, and duration of such committees consistent with the purposes of this Act. The membership shall be representatives of (1) employers from any relevant industry or occupation for which the committee is established; (2) trade or professional organizations representing any relevant occupations; and (3) organized labor, where appropriate.

"(e) The imposition of any State rule or policy relating to the administration and operation of programs funded by this Act (including any rule or policy based on State interpretation of any Federal law, regulation, or guideline) shall be identified as a State imposed requirement.

"STATE COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Establishment.
20 USC 2322.

"SEC. 112. (a) Each State which desires to participate in vocational education programs authorized by this Act for any fiscal year shall establish a State council, which shall be appointed by the Governor or, in the case of States in which the members of the State board of education are elected (including election by the State legislature), by such board. Each State council shall be composed of 13 individuals, and shall be broadly representative of citizens and groups within the State having an interest in vocational education. Each State council shall consist of—

"(1) seven individuals who are representative of the private sector in the State who shall constitute a majority of the membership—

"(A) five of whom shall be representative of business, industry, and agriculture including—

"(i) one member who is representative of small business concerns; and

"(ii) one member who is a private sector member of the State job training coordinating council (established pursuant to section 122 of the Job Training Partnership Act), and 29 USC 1532

"(B) two of whom shall be representatives of labor organizations;

"(2) six individuals who are representative of secondary and postsecondary vocational institutions (equitably distributed among such institutions), career guidance and counseling organizations within the State, individuals who have special knowledge and qualifications with respect to the special educational and career development needs of special populations (including women, the disadvantaged, the handicapped, individuals with limited English proficiency, and minorities) and of whom one member shall be representative of special education.

In selecting individuals under subsection (a) to serve on the State council, due consideration shall be given to the appointment of individuals who serve on a private industry council under the Job Training Partnership Act, or on State councils established under other related Federal Acts. 29 USC 1501 note

"(b) The State shall certify the establishment and membership of the State council at least 90 days prior to the beginning of each planning period described in section 113(a)(1). *Post*, p. 2445

"(c) Each State council shall meet as soon as practical after certification has been accepted by the Secretary and shall select from among its membership a chairperson who shall be representative of the private sector. The time, place, and manner of meeting, as well as council operating procedures and staffing, shall be as provided by the rules of the State council, except that such rules must provide for not less than one public meeting each year at which the public is given an opportunity to express views concerning the vocational education program of the State.

"(d) Each State council shall—

"(1) meet with the State board or its representatives during the planning year to advise on the development of the State plan;

"(2) advise the State board and make reports to the Governor, the business community, and general public of the State, concerning—

"(A) policies the State should pursue to strengthen vocational education (with particular attention to programs for the handicapped); and

"(B) initiatives and methods the private sector could undertake to assist in the modernization of vocational education programs;

"(3) analyze and report on the distribution of spending for vocational education in the State and on the availability of vocational education activities and services within the State;

"(4) furnish consultation to the State board on the establishment of evaluation criteria for vocational education programs within the State;

"(5) submit recommendations to the State board on the conduct of vocational education programs conducted in the State which emphasize the use of business concerns and labor organizations;

"(6) assess the distribution of financial assistance furnished under this Act, particularly with the analysis of the distribution of financial assistance between secondary vocational education programs and postsecondary vocational education programs; *Ante*, p. 2435

"(7) recommend procedures to the State board to ensure and enhance the participation of the public in the provision of vocational education at the local level within the State, particularly the participation of local employers and local labor organizations;

"(8) report to the State board on the extent to which the individuals described in section 201(b) are provided with equal access to quality vocational education programs; and *Post*, p. 2450

"(9)(A) evaluate at least once every two years (i) the vocational education program delivery systems assisted under this Act, and under the Job Training Partnership Act, in terms of their adequacy and effectiveness in achieving the purposes of each of the two Acts and (ii) make recommendations to the State board on the adequacy and effectiveness of the coordination that takes place between vocational education and the Job Training Partnership Act and (B) advise the Governor, the State board, the State job training coordinating council, the Secretary, and the Secretary of Labor of these findings and recommendations. 29 USC 1501 note

"(e) Each State council is authorized to obtain the services of such professional, technical, and clerical, personnel as may be necessary to enable it to carry out its functions under this Act and to contract for such services as may be necessary to enable the Council to carry out its evaluation functions, independent of programmatic and administrative control by other State boards, agencies, and individuals. Contracts with U.S.

"(f)(1)(A) From the amounts appropriated pursuant to section 3(c) the Secretary shall make grants to State councils from amounts allotted to State councils in accordance with the method for allotment contained in section 101(a)(2), without regard to paragraph (3), except that no State council shall be allotted less than $120,000 nor more than $225,000 for each fiscal year. Grants *Ante*, p. 2437 *Ante*, p. 2438

"(B) For the purpose of subparagraph (A), the term 'State' shall not include the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Northern Mariana Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

"(2) The expenditure of the funds paid pursuant to this subsection is to be determined solely by the State council for carrying out its functions under this Act, and may not be diverted or reprogramed for any other purpose by any State board, agency, or individual. Each State council shall designate an appropriate State agency or other public agency, eligible to receive funds under this Act, to act as its fiscal agent for purposes of disbursement, accounting, and auditing.

"STATE PLANS

"SEC. 113. (a)(1)(A) Any State desiring to receive funds from its allotment for any fiscal year shall submit to the Secretary a State plan for a three-year period in the case of the initial plan and a 2-year period thereafter, together with such annual revisions as the State board determines to be necessary. 20 USC 2323

"(B) The planning periods required by paragraph (1) of this subsection shall be coterminous with the planning program periods required under section 104(a) of the Job Training Partnership Act. *29 USC 1514*

"(2)(A) In formulating the State plan (and amendments thereto) the State board shall meet with and utilize the State council, established pursuant to section 112 of this Act. *Ante, p. 2443*

"(B) The State board shall conduct public hearings in the State, after appropriate and sufficient notice, for the purpose of affording all segments of the public and interested organizations and groups an opportunity to present their views and make recommendations regarding the State plan. A summary of such recommendations and the State board's response shall be included with the State plan.

"(3) In developing the State plan, the State shall—

"(A) assess the current and projected occupational needs and the current and projected demand for general occupational skills within the State;

"(B) examine the needs of students, including adults, in order to determine how best to improve student skill levels in light of the State's occupational and skill requirements;

"(C) assess the special needs of groups of individuals specified in section 201(b) for access to vocational education and vocational services in terms of labor market needs; *Post, p. 2450*

"(D) assess the quality of vocational education in terms of—

"(i) the pertinence of programs to the workplace and to new and emerging technologies,

"(ii) the responsiveness of programs to the current and projected occupational needs in the State,

"(iii) the capacity of programs to facilitate entry into, and participation in, vocational education and to ease the school-to-work and secondary-to-postsecondary transition,

"(iv) the technological and educational quality of vocational curricula, equipment, and instructional materials to enable vocational students and instructors to meet the challenges of increased technological demands of the workplace; and

"(v) the capability of vocational education programs to meet the needs for general occupational skills and improvement of academic foundations in order to address the changing content of jobs;

"(E) determine the capacity of local educational agencies, with respect to secondary education and postsecondary educational institutions, to deliver the vocational education services necessary to meet the needs identified through the assessments required by clauses (A) through (D) of this paragraph; and

"(F) determine, for each fiscal year, how the services and activities supported by funds furnished under this Act may be expected to assist the State in meeting the needs identified through the assessments required by clauses (A) through (D) of this paragraph. *Ante, p. 2435*

"(b) Each such plan shall—

"(1) provide assurances that, and where necessary a description of the manner in which, the State board will comply with the requirements of titles I, II, III, and V of this Act, including— *Ante, p. 2438; post, pp. 2450, 2457, 2479.*

"(A) a description of the manner in which the State will comply with the criteria required for programs for the handicapped and for the disadvantaged prescribed by section 204; *Post, p. 2454*

"(B) assurances that the State will comply with the distribution of assistance requirements contained in section 203; and *Post, p. 2453*

"(C) assurances that, to the extent consistent with the number and location of individuals described in clauses (1) and (2) of section 201(b) in the State who are enrolled in private elementary and secondary schools, provision is made for the participation of such individuals in the vocational education program assisted under part A of title II of this Act; *Post, p. 2450* *Post, p. 2450*

"(2) set forth the planned uses of Federal funds available for vocational education for each fiscal year for which the plan is submitted and describe how the State did carry out the provisions of section 113(a)(3); *Ante, p. 2445*

"(3) describe progress the State has made in achieving the goals set forth in each State plan subsequent to the initial State plan;

-229-

* "(4) provide assurances that the State will distribute at least 80 percent of the funds made available for parts A and B of title II to eligible recipients, or combination of eligible recipients, except that the State will distribute 100 percent of the funds available for clauses (1) and (2) of section 202, relating to the disadvantaged and the handicapped, to eligible recipients in accordance with section 203(a); *Post, pp. 2450, 2455* *Post, p. 2452* *Post, p. 2453*

"(5) set forth the criteria the State board will use in approving applications of eligible recipients and allocating funds made available under this Act to such recipients, which shall ensure that States will allocate more Federal funds to eligible recipients in units of local government which are economically depressed (including both urban and rural units) or which have high unemployment, as determined by the State; *Ante, p. 2435*

"(6) provide such methods of administration as are necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the Act;

* "(7) provide assurances that, in the use of funds available for single parents and homemakers under section 201(b)(3), that the State will emphasize assisting individuals with the greatest financial need, and that in serving homemakers the State will give special consideration to homemakers who because of divorce, separation, or the death or disability of a spouse must prepare for paid employment; *Post, p. 2450*

* "(8) provide assurances that the State will furnish relevant training and vocational education activities to men and women who desire to enter occupations that are not traditionally associated with their sex;

"(9)(A) provide assurances that the State will develop measures for the effectiveness of programs assisted under this Act in meeting the needs identified in the State plan, including evaluative measurements such as—

"(i) the occupations to be trained for, which will reflect a realistic assessment of the labor market needs of the State;

"(ii) the levels of skills to be achieved in particular occupations, which will reflect the hiring needs of employers; and

"(iii) the basic employment competencies to be used in performance outcomes, which will reflect the hiring needs of employers;

"(2) describe the coordination with relevant programs conducted under the Job Training Partnership Act and the Adult Education Act, to avoid duplication.

29 USC 1501 note. 20 USC 1201 note. Public inspection.

"(b) Each such local application shall be available for review and comment by interested parties, including the appropriate administrative entity under the Job Training Partnership Act.

"(c)(1) Eligible recipients providing relatively few vocational education programs, services, and activities funded with limited total Federal and State funds may, as determined by the State board, be exempt from the requirements of subsection (a) or (b) or both.

"(2) Each State board shall identify in its State plan the appropriate criteria for determining such exemptions.

"TITLE II—BASIC STATE GRANTS FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

"PART A—VOCATIONAL EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES

"USES OF FUNDS

20 USC 2331 *Ante*, p. 2438.

"SEC. 201. (a) From the portion of the allotment of each State under section 101 available for this part, each State shall provide vocational education services and activities designed to meet the special needs of groups of individuals specified in subsection (b).

"(b) To meet the needs identified in the State plan, each State shall use the portion of its allotment available for this part in any fiscal year to provide vocational education services and activities designed to meet the special needs of, and to enhance the participation of—

"(1) handicapped individuals;

"(2) disadvantaged individuals;

"(3) adults who are in need of training and retraining;

"(4) individuals who are single parents or homemakers;

"(5) individuals who participate in programs designed to eliminate sex bias and stereotyping in vocational education; and

"(6) criminal offenders who are serving in a correctional institution.

"(c)(1) Each State shall use the portion of its allotment available for this part in any fiscal year for handicapped individuals only for the Federal share of expenditures limited to supplemental or additional staff, equipment, materials, and services not provided to other individuals in vocational education that are essential for handicapped individuals to participate in vocational education. If the conditions of handicapped students require a separate program, each State may use such funds for the Federal share of the costs of the services and activities in separate vocational education programs for handicapped individuals which exceed the average average per-pupil expenditures for regular services and activities of the eligible recipient.

"(2) Each State shall use the portion of its allotment available for this part in any fiscal year for disadvantaged individuals only for the Federal share of expenditures limited to supplemental or additional staff, equipment, materials, and services not provided to other individuals in vocational education that are essential for disadvantaged individuals to participate in vocational education. If the conditions of disadvantaged individuals require a separate program, each State may use such funds for the Federal share of the costs of the services and activities in separate vocational education programs for disadvantaged individuals which exceed the average per-pupil expenditures for regular services and activities of the eligible recipient.

"(d)(1) Each State may use the portion of its allotment available for this part for any fiscal year for the improvement of vocational education services and activities designed to provide equal access to quality vocational education to disadvantaged individuals, the costs of services and activities which apply the latest technological advances to courses of instruction, and, subject to the provisions of paragraph (2), the acquisition of modern machinery and tools.

"(2) Funds available to each recipient under this part for the disadvantaged may be expended for the acquisition of modern machinery and tools in schools at which at least 75 percent of the students enrolled are economically disadvantaged.

"(e)(1) Each State shall use the portion of its allotment available for this part to provide, improve, and expand adult and postsecondary vocational education services and activities to train and retrain adults.

"(2) Funds used for the purpose described in subsection (a) may be used for services and activities developed in coordination with the State agency administering title III of the Job Training Partnership Act. 29 USC 1651.

"(3) Funds for services and activities under this section may be used for—

"(A) additional training under title III of the Job Training Partnership Act;

"(B) vocational education programs for training or retraining adults, including programs for older individuals and displaced homemakers;

"(C) the costs of serving adults in other vocational education programs, including paying the costs of instruction or the costs of keeping school facilities open longer;

"(D) individuals who have completed or left high school and who are enrolled in organized programs of study for which credit is given toward an associate or other degree, but which programs are not designed as baccalaureate or higher degree programs; and

"(E) individuals who have already entered the labor market, or have completed or left high school, and who are not described in clause (D).

"(f) Each State may only use the portion of its allotment available for this part to—

"(1) provide, subsidize, reimburse or pay for vocational education and training activities, including basic literacy instruction and necessary educational materials, that will furnish single parents and homemakers with marketable skills;

"(2) make grants to eligible recipients for expanding vocational education services when this expansion directly increases the eligible recipients' capacity for providing single parents and homemakers with marketable skills;

"(3) make grants to community-based organizations for the provision of vocational education services to single parents and homemakers, if the State determines that the community-based organization has demonstrated effectiveness in providing comparable or related services to single parents and homemakers, taking into account the demonstrated performance of such an organization in terms of cost, the quality of training and the characteristics of the participants;

"(4) make vocational education and training more accessible to single parents and homemakers by assisting them with child care or transportation services or by organizing and scheduling the programs so that such programs are more accessible; or

"(5) provide information to single parents and homemakers to inform them of vocational education programs and related support services.

Infra

"(g) That portion of the allotment described in section 202(5) shall be available for—

"(1) programs, services, and activities to eliminate sex bias and stereotyping in secondary and postsecondary vocational education;

"(2) vocational education programs, services, and activities for girls and women, aged 14 through 25, designed to enable the participants to support themselves and their families; and

"(3) support services for individuals participating in vocational education programs, services, and activities described in clauses (1) and (2) including dependent-care services and transportation.

Ante, p. 2441

The requirement with respect to age limitations contained in clause (2) of subsection (a) may be waived whenever the individual described in section 111(bX1) determines that the waiver is essential to meet the objectives of this section.

"(hX1) Each State may use the portion of its allotment available for this part in any fiscal year for basic skills instruction for vocational education students and related to their instructional program whenever the State board determines that such instruction is necessary to carry out the purposes described in subsection (b) of this section.

"(2) Each State may use the portion of its allotment available for this part in any fiscal year for the provision of educational training through arrangements with private vocational training institutions, private postsecondary educational institutions, and employers whenever such institutions or employers can make a significant contribution to obtaining the objectives of the State plan and can provide substantially equivalent training at a lesser cost, or can provide equipment or services not available in public institutions.

"(iX1) Vocational education services and activities described in subsection (b) shall, to the extent practicable, include work-site programs such as cooperative vocational education, work-study, and apprenticeship programs.

"(2) Vocational education services and activities described in subsection (b) may include placement services for students who have successfully completed vocational education programs.

"DISTRIBUTION OF ASSISTANCE

20 USC 2332

"Sec. 202. From the portion of the allotment of each State available for this part for each fiscal year—

Handicapped persons

"(1) 10 percent of the funds available for this title shall be available for handicapped individuals;

Disadvantaged persons

"(2) 22 percent of such funds shall be available for disadvantaged individuals;

"(3) 12 percent of such funds shall be available for adults who are in need of training and retraining;

"(4) 8.5 percent of such funds shall be available for individuals who are single parents and homemakers;

"(5) 3.5 percent of such funds shall be available for individuals who are participants in programs designed to eliminate sex bias and stereotyping in vocational education; and

"(6) 1 percent of such funds shall be made available for criminal offenders who are in correctional institutions.

"WITHIN STATE ALLOCATION

20 USC 2333

"Sec. 203. (aX1XA) The State board shall allocate the 10 percent of the amount allotted to the State and available for this title for vocational education services and activities for the handicapped to eligible recipients in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph.

"(B) Of the amount allocated under this paragraph—

Disadvantaged persons

"(i) 50 percent of such amount shall be allocated to eligible recipients on the basis of the relative number of economically disadvantaged individuals enrolled in each eligible recipient in the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year in which the determination is made to the total number of such individuals enrolled in all eligible recipients within the State in such year; and

Handicapped persons

"(ii) 50 percent shall be allocated on the basis of the relative number of handicapped students served in vocational education programs by each eligible recipient within the State in the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the determination is made as compared to the total number of such individuals served by all eligible recipients within the State in such year.

"(2XA) The State board shall allocate the 22 percent of the amount allotted to the State and available for this title for vocational education services and activities for the disadvantaged to eligible recipients in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph.

Disadvantaged persons

"(B) Of the amount allocated under this paragraph—

"(i) 50 percent of such amount shall be allocated to eligible recipients on the basis of the relative number of economically disadvantaged individuals enrolled in each eligible recipient in the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year in which the determination is made compared to the total number of such individuals enrolled in all eligible recipients within the State in such year; and

"(ii) 50 percent shall be allocated on the basis of the relative number of disadvantaged individuals and individuals with limited English proficiency served in vocational education programs by each eligible recipient within the State in the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the determination is made as compared to the total number of such individuals served by all eligible recipients within the State in such year.

"(3) The State board shall assure that sums allocated among eligible recipients pursuant to this subsection shall be used by an eligible recipient for vocational education services and activities for individuals with limited English proficiency in the same proportion as the number of individuals with limited English proficiency served by each eligible recipient within the State in the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the determination is made bears to the population of the State in that year.

"(4) Each local educational agency shall use, to the extent feasible, community-based organizations of demonstrated effectiveness, in

"USES OF FUNDS

20 USC 2352 *Ante, p. 2438.*

"SEC. 302. (a) From the portion of the allotment of each State under section 101 available for this part, each State shall provide financial assistance to joint programs of eligible recipients and community-based organizations within the State for the conduct of special vocational education services and activities described in subsection (b).

"(b) Funds provided under this section may be used in accordance with State plans for—

"(1) outreach programs to facilitate the entrance of youth into a program of transitional services and subsequent entrance into vocational education, employment or other education and training;

"(2) transitional services such as attitudinal and motivational prevocational training programs;

"(3) prevocational educational preparation and basic skills development conducted in cooperation with business concerns;

"(4) special prevocational preparations programs targeted to inner-city youth, non-English speaking youth, Appalachian youth, and the youth of other urban and rural areas having a high density of poverty who need special prevocational education programs;

"(5) career intern programs;

"(6) assessment of students needs in relation to vocational education and jobs; and

"(7) guidance and counseling to assist students with occupational choices and with the selection of a vocational education program.

"PART B—CONSUMER AND HOMEMAKER EDUCATION

"CONSUMER AND HOMEMAKER EDUCATION GRANTS

20 USC 2361

"SEC. 311. From the portion of the allotment of each State under section 101 available for this part, the Secretary is authorized to make grants to States to assist them in conducting consumer and homemaker education programs. Such programs may include (1) instructional programs, services, and activities that prepare youth and adults for the occupation of homemaking, and (2) instruction in the areas of food and nutrition, consumer education, family living and parenthood education, child development and guidance, housing, home management (including resource management), and clothing and textiles.

"USE OF FUNDS FROM CONSUMER AND HOMEMAKER EDUCATION GRANTS

20 USC 2362 *Ante, p. 2449.*

"SEC. 312. (a) Grants to any State under this part shall be used, in accordance with State plans approved under section 114—

"(1) to conduct programs in economically depressed areas;

"(2) to encourage participation of traditionally underserved populations;

"(3) to encourage the elimination of sex bias and sex stereotyping;

"(4) to improve, expand, and update programs with an emphasis on those which specifically address needs described under clauses (1), (2), and (3); and

"(5) to address priorities and emerging concerns at the local, State, and national levels.

"(b) Grants for the purposes set forth in subsection (a) may be used for—

"(1) program development and improvement of instruction and curricula relating to managing individual and family resources, making consumer choices, managing home and work responsibilities, improving responses to individual and family crises, strengthening parenting skills, assisting aged and handicapped individuals, improving nutrition, conserving limited resources, understanding the impact of new technology on life and work, applying consumer and homemaker education skills to jobs and careers, and other needs as determined by the State; and

"(2) support services and activities designed to ensure the quality and effectiveness of programs, including demonstration of innovative and exemplary projects, community outreach to underserved populations, application of academic skills (such as reading, writing, mathematics, and science) through consumer and homemaker education programs, curriculum development, research, program evaluation, development of instructional materials, teacher education, upgrading of equipment, teacher supervision, and State administration and leadership, including activities of the student organization.

"(c) Not less than one-third of the Federal funds made available to any State under this section shall be expended in economically depressed areas or areas with high rates of unemployment for programs designed to assist consumers and to help improve home environments and the quality of family life.

"INFORMATION DISSEMINATION AND LEADERSHIP

20 USC 2363

"SEC. 313. (a) The State board shall ensure that the experience and information gained through carrying out programs assisted under this part is shared with administrators for the purpose of program planning. Funds available under this part shall be used to assist in providing State leadership qualified by experience and preparation in home economics education.

"(b) Not more than 6 percent of the funds available under this part may be used to carry out leadership activities under this section.

"PART C—ADULT TRAINING, RETRAINING, AND EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT

"FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

20 USC 2371

"SEC. 321. (a) The Congress finds that—

"(1) technological change, international competition, and the demographics of the Nation's work force have resulted in increases in the numbers of adult workers who are unemployed, who have been dislocated, or who require training, retraining, or upgrading of skills,

"(2) many women entering and reentering the paid labor market are disproportionately employed in low-wage occupations and require additional training, "(3) many adults cannot gain access to or benefit fully from vocational education due to limited English proficiency, and

"(4) these needs can be met by vocational education programs that are responsive to the needs of individuals and the demands of the labor market.

"(b) It is the purpose of this part (1) to provide financial assistance to the States to enable them to expand and improve vocational education programs designed to meet urgent needs for training, retraining, and employment development of adults who have completed or left high school and are preparing to enter or have entered the labor market, in order to equip adults with the competencies and skills required for productive employment, and (2) to ensure that such programs are relevant to the labor market needs and accessible to all segments of the population, including women, minorities, the handicapped, individuals with limited English proficiency, workers fifty-five and older, and the economically disadvantaged.

"AUTHORIZATION OF GRANTS AND USES OF FUNDS

20 USC 2372
Ante, p. 2438

"SEC. 322. (a) From the portion of the allotment of each State under section 101 available for this part, the Secretary shall make grants to the States for programs, services, and activities authorized by this part.

"(b)(1) Grants to States under this part may be used, in accordance with State plans, for—

Ante, p. 2450

"(A) vocational education programs, services, activities, and employment development authorized by title II which are designed to meet the needs of—

"(i) individuals who have graduated from or left high school and who need additional vocational education for entry into the labor force;

"(ii) unemployed individuals who require training to obtain employment or increase their employability;

"(iii) employed individuals who require retraining to retain their jobs, or who need training to upgrade their skills to qualify for higher paid or more dependable employment;

* "(iv) displaced homemakers and single heads of households who are entering or reentering the labor force;

"(v) employers who require assistance in training individuals for new employment opportunities or in retraining employees in new skills required by changes in technology, products, or processes; and

"(vi) workers fifty-five and older;

"(B) short-term programs of retraining designed to upgrade or update skills in accordance with changed work requirements;

"(C) education and training programs designed cooperatively with employers, such as—

"(i) institutional and worksite programs, including apprenticeship training programs (or combinations of such programs) especially tailored to the needs of an industry or group of industries for skilled workers, technicians, or managers, or to assist their existing work force to adjust to changes in technology or work requirements; and

"(ii) quick-start, customized training for workers in new and expanding industries, or for workers for placement in

jobs that are difficult to fill because of a shortage of workers with the requisite skills,

"(D) building more effective linkages between vocational education programs and private sector employers (through a variety of programs including programs where secondary school students are employed on a part-time basis as registered apprentices with transition to full-time apprenticeships upon graduation), and between eligible recipients of assistance under this Act and economic development agencies and other public and private agencies providing job training and employment services, in order to more effectively reach out to and serve individuals described in subparagraph (A); *Ante*, p. 243

"(E) cooperative education programs with public and private sector employers and economic development agencies, including seminars in institutional or worksite settings, designed to improve management and increase productivity;

"(F) entrepreneurship training programs which assist individuals in the establishment, management, and operation of small business enterprises;

"(G) recruitment, job search assistance, counseling, remedial services, and information and outreach programs designed to encourage and assist males and females to take advantage of vocational education programs and services, with particular attention to reaching women, older workers, individuals with limited English proficiency, the handicapped, and the disadvantaged;

-233-

"(H) curriculum development, acquisition of instructional equipment and materials, personnel training, pilot projects, and related and additional services and activities required to effectively carry out the purposes of this part;

"(I) the costs of serving adults in other vocational education programs, including paying the costs of instruction or the costs of keeping school facilities open longer; and

"(J) related instruction for apprentices in apprenticeship training programs.

"(2) In making grants under this part, the Secretary shall require each State, in its State plan (or an amendment thereto), to assure that programs—

"(A) are designed with the active participation of the State council established pursuant to section 112; *Ante*, p. 211

"(B) make maximum effective use of existing institutions, are planned to avoid duplication of programs or institutional capabilities, and to the fullest extent practicable are designed to strengthen institutional capacity to meet the education and training needs addressed by this part;

"(C) involve close cooperation with and participation by public and private sector employers and public and private agencies working with problems of employment and training and economic development; and

"(D) where appropriate, involve coordination with programs under the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the Education of the Handicapped Act. 29 USC 701 20 USC 140

"COORDINATION WITH THE JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT

"SEC. 323. (a) Each State receiving grants under this part shall include in the State plan methods and procedures for coordinating 20 USC 237

APPENDIX M

AVERAGE ENROLLMENT IN VOCATIONAL SUBJECTS BY SEX

Vocational Subjects	Student Vocational Credits	
	Males	Females
Consumer and Homemaking Education	0.28	0.98
General Labor Market Preparation	0.90	1.03
Typing I	0.37	0.71
Introductory Industrial	0.28	0.03
Work Experience/Career Exploration	0.17	0.15
General Skills	0.08	0.14
Specific Labor Market Preparation	3.11	2.39
Agriculture	0.35	0.07
Business	0.49	1.48
Business Management	0.19	0.25
Business Support	0.30	1.23
Marketing and Distribution	0.14	0.16
Health	0.02	0.06
Occupational Home Economics	0.04	0.27
Trade and Industrial	1.76	0.18
Construction Trades	0.24	0.01
Mechanics and Repairers	0.44	0.01
Precision Production	1.07	0.16
Transportation	0.01	0.00
Technical and Communications	0.12	0.08
All Vocational Education	4.30	4.41

Source: See table 1-1.

APPENDIX N

DISTRIBUTION OF HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES ENTERING POSTSECONDARY VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN PUBLIC TWO-YEAR COLLEGES, TECHNICAL INSTITUTES, AND PRIVATE VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS, CLASSES OF 1972 AND 1980

(Percentage)

Student Characteristics	Class of 1972	Class of 1980
All students	14.8%	17.9%
Male	14.9	16.4
Female	14.7	19.3
White	14.8	17.9
Black	13.3	15.8
Hispanic	18.4	21.6
Low SES	13.7	18.5
High SES	12.4	13.5
Low ability (in high school)	15.0	18.8
High ability	9.5	11.3
Academic program	12.2	13.2
Vocational program	17.0	24.6
General program	16.7	18.2
Education aspirations (in high school)		
High school only	6.7	9.3
Vocational certificate	26.8	28.9
Associate degree	36.2	34.7
Bachelor's degree	9.4	13.2
Postgraduate degree	6.6	9.2

Sources: NLS-72 Seniors and HS&B Seniors, 1980.

Second Interim Report - From the National Assessment of Vocational Education, September, 1988

APPENDIX O

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: REPORT BY NACVE AND NACWEP

The National Advisory Council on Vocational Education and the National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs initiated this joint study of the sex equity provisions of the 1976 Vocational Education Amendments to examine whether their implementation had resulted in equitable access to and benefit from the nation's vocational education system by women and men, girls and boys.

The study results will assist the Councils in providing, under their respective legislative mandates, substantive comments and recommendations to the Secretary of Education, the Congress, and the President regarding the upcoming reauthorization of this legislation; they should also prove useful to educators, students, and citizens involved in vocational education.

The various phases of the study focused on such crosscutting issues as funding mechanisms; Federal and state roles; local implementation; special needs of women; state Sex Equity Coordinators; State Plans, Reports, and public hearings; administrators, counselors, and instructors; curricula and texts; and related legislation. The study included a meeting with Sex Equity Coordinators; preliminary interviews and a subsequent forum with interested agencies and organizations to discuss the critical issues; two regional public hearings attended by persons from 21 states; detailed analysis of enrollment data and various state plans and reports from 15 selected states (representing 55% of all vocational enrollments); and a review of recent research relevant to the study. The major findings of the study are summarized below.

Review of Recent Research

- Those schools putting the most effort into various activities to further equity were also those with the highest Non-traditional enrollment of women. Furthermore, the more attention the state paid to what the school was doing, the more the school tended to do.

- There must be considerably more emphasis at all levels on activities designed to overcome inequities in addition to the monitoring and reviewing designed to discover such inequities.

- Successful sex equity programs established a liaison with potential employers, provided participants with support services and orientation to the program, instituted comprehensive evaluation, and employed competent and dedicated staff. More identification and dissemination of such programs is needed.

- There have been significantly greater increases in adult women's enrollment in Non-traditional programs through post-secondary and adult education than in high school women's enrollment in Non-traditional programs.

- As of 1975, the vocational expectations and occupational choices of working class women were conspicuously absent from research literature, despite the fact that most are employed a large part of their lives.

State Plan and Reports

- Most of the selected State Plans contained general statements indicating good intentions without defining specific methods for carrying out these intentions.

- Although the legislation mandates that women knowledgeable in sex equity issues be represented on State Advisory Councils for Vocational Education (SACVEs), and in addition that minority women be represented, information available in state reports made it difficult to discern if these mandates were followed.

- Attempts by most of the states to provide financial incentives for efforts to address sex equity were diverse but relatively minor and often hard to identify within broader projects.

- Comparison of State Plans with Accountability Reports showed that many states did not expend the full $50,000 specifically allocated to the work of the Sex Equity Coordinator and there was no evidence that unexpended balances were carried over to the following years' budgets.

- Although a large number of the states committed funds to displaced homemaker services, there was no evidence that these funds were being used as was legislatively mandated.

- Most states reported that they were monitoring and reviewing for sex equity, but there was little information regarding what happened once plans, proposals, and activities were reviewed.

- Several states reported that they encouraged the entire state staff to become aware of and assume responsibility for sex equity activities, but the specific activities which resulted were not reported.

- Within all of the selected states, the major effort of Sex Equity Coordinators, in addition to monitoring and reviewing, was conducting workshops and seminars and disseminating related information.

- In most cases the State Plan responded to the requirements of the Federal regulations, however, in only a few cases did the state attempt to go further and define its problems or offer a system or method for eliminating sex bias at the local level.

- Many SACVEs or participants at public hearings on State Plans recommended that the state should be funding programs to deal with sex equity issues. Nevertheless, only a few states allocated additional funds for programs, and many states that allocated funds did not expend them.

- States rarely appeared to have been influenced by other recommendations from SACVEs or from the State Plan public hearings.

- The impact of the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education's Management Evaluation Reviews for Compliance and Quality and staff reports on the State Plans was difficult to assess.

Enrollment Data (1972-1978)

- National enrollments in all occupational training areas increased by 44%, with an influx of over three million additional students. The enrollment increase was greater for women than for men. Women increased by 1.8 million (60% more than their enrollment in 1972), while men increased by 1.4 million (32% more than their enrollment in 1972.)

- While the actual number of women enrolled nationally in Traditional vocational programs increased by 723,700, the percent (i.e., concentration) of all women vocational students who were in Traditional programs decreased by 9 points, from 65% to 56%.

- Women made greater enrollment gains in Mixed programs than in Non-traditional programs. The number of women in Mixed programs increased by 756,500 (up 5%) while the number in Non-traditional programs increased by 312,300 (up 4%).

- Increases in women's enrollment in Non-traditional programs were greater in Technical and in Agricultural programs than in Trade and Industrial programs.

- Percent increases in women's enrollment in Non-traditional Trade and Industrial programs occurred in courses without a strong sex role image, such as drafting, law enforcement, and graphic arts, rather than in courses with a strong male role image such as construction, police science, and machine shop.

- In the 15 states studied, there were greater increases in the percent of women enrolled in Non-traditional programs between 1972 and 1976 than between 1976 and 1978, even considering that the first time period is twice as long as the second.

- The amount and type of detail provided in the Plans of the 15 states regarding implementation of the sex equity provisions varied and sometimes correlated with improved enrollment patterns for women. Greatest increases in enrollment of women in Non-traditional programs occurred in states where planning and monitoring systems were established to meet equity goals, where funds were committed to establish equity programs, and where efforts were made to utilize the entire state staff to address sex equity issues.

Public Hearings

- Negative attitudes about non-traditional training choices and expansion of male/female roles are still prevalent in state agencies, school districts, and communities, and constitute a major barrier to equity.

- More focus is needed on pre-service and in-service training of vocational education staff, especially to get more women into administrative positions, and men and women into non-traditional teaching positions.

- There is a crucial need for adequate, affordable childcare services.

- Transportation and other supportive services are often critical, especially to poor or rural women's participation in a vocational program.

- Witnesses felt that the law is too vague or lenient in the areas of childcare, displaced homemakers, curriculum revision, training and personnel development, guidance and counseling, and assistance to women in preparing for and obtaining non-traditional employment.

- The role of the Sex Equity Coordinator is viewed as essential to the task of achieving equity.

- The across-the-board funding of $50,000 is not sufficient in every state for full-time sex equity personnel and many Coordinators have been unable to secure additional funds to implement programs.

- Sex equity must be viewed as a human issue that affects men as well as women.

- Minority women need supportive services, programs which address their cultural differences, and outreach efforts to change the negative image of vocational education in their communities.

- Attempts by persons outside of the vocational education system to monitor and review State Plans and testify at the mandated public hearings had shown mixed results, and often proved extremely frustrating.

- More sex-fair textbooks and materials infused into the curricula are needed to expand students' views of their potential career options and expose them to women and men in non-traditional jobs.

- Exploratory vocational programs at the junior high school level help students make better career decisions in high school, when peer presure to conform to traditional sex roles is strongest.

- More emphasis on sex equity in postsecondary vocational education is needed to meet the needs of those adult women who make career decisions later in life than men.

- The problem of sexual harassment is increasing as more women enter non-traditional classes.

- Broad legislative coordination with other youth, education, and employment programs is needed in order to achieve sex equity in vocational education.

APPENDIX P

FACTS ON UNITED STATES WORKING WOMEN

U.S. Department of Labor
Women's Bureau, 1920-1985

Fact Sheet No. 85-9
July 1985

ADVANCES FOR WOMEN THROUGH FEDERAL LEGISLATION DURING THE UNITED NATIONS DECADE FOR WOMEN, 1976-1985

- During the United Nations Decade for Women, the United States policymakers took many steps toward making equal employment opportunity (EEO) a reality. The foundation for a strong EEO policy was in place in the mid-1970's, but the application of many pertinent laws was far from clear.

- Policymakers did much testing and fine-tuning of the basic legislation during the period covered by the decade. A supportive climate was provided by concurrent world and national conferences and "plans of action" focusing on improving the employment status of women.

- Two major challenges were met. One was to strengthen and coordinate enforcement of existing legislation, the second to clarify ways to apply the laws in specific situations.

- Federal legislation and guidelines, as well as decisions of Federal courts, ran the gamut of women's employment issues. They clarified policy in such areas as:

  - Women's access to better jobs in construction, apprenticeship, and certain occupations in the armed services;
  - Pensions and social security for workers and their spouses;
  - Discrimination against pregnant workers;
  - Sexual harassment;
  - Pay equity;
  - Child care for working parents; and
  - Training and vocational education.

- Renewed attention was focused on job safety and health hazards to which women were exposed; industries employing large numbers of women or dominated by female employees were given a closer look. And toward the other end of the occupational spectrum, Federal policy was developed to encourage women to own their own businesses. At the close of the decade, affirmative action policy was

U.S. Department of Labor
Office of the Secretary
Women's Bureau
200 Constitution Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20210-9990

Official Business
Penalty for private use $300
M-020

Postage and Fees Paid
U.S. Department of Labor

Third Class Mail

Lab 441

being reassessed in a continuing effort to find the most equitable means of overcoming systemic patterns of discrimination.

- In a massive effort to root out sexually discriminating language from the laws of the land, Federal agencies systematically reviewed the entire U.S. Code and regulations, identifying laws that treat women and men differently and policies that have an adverse impact on women. Many States did the same.
- The roles of both Federal and State governments were examined by policymakers every time a specific issue received attention. Laws were revised to give the States more responsibility in planning and operating programs related to jobs. Overall, a spirit of greater cooperation was promoted between government at all levels and the private sector.
- Addressing the international scene, legislation decreed that the Peace Corps should work on integrating women into the national economy of whatever developing countries the corps served. International development assistance legislation focused on the full integration of women in the development of their countries' economy.
- The legislative products of the decade gave women's equity advocates considerable encouragement, as well as further incentive to continue their efforts.

Reference: The United Nations Decade for Women, 1976-1985: Employment in the United States, U.S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau, July 1985.

APPENDIX Q

POSITION PAPERS ON THE REAUTHORIZATION OF THE CARL D. PERKINS ACT OF 1984 BY:

Q1 American Association of University Women
Q2 Wider Opportunities for Women
Q3 Vocational Education Equity Council

Q1

POSITION PAPER

WOMEN AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

The Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984 will expire on Sept. 30, 1989, with an automatic extension through 1991. Discussions are already under way among members of Congress, community organizations, educators and advocacy groups about how to improve vocational education (voc ed) for our nation's present and prospective workforce. AAUW will focus its energies on provisions which will affect access to and quality of voc ed programs for women and girls. AAUWs preliminary recommendations are as follows.

- The Perkins Act requires states to "set-aside" from their basic grants 3.5% for programs to eliminate sex stereotyping and encourage enrollment in nontraditional occupation, and 8.5% for programs to provide single parents with marketable skills. **AAUW urges Congress to reauthorize the 3.5% sex equity and 8.5% single parent set-asides.**
- The Vocational Education Amendments of 1976 authorized, and the Perkins Act funded, a full-time administrator to oversee sex equity programs. However, in many states, the vocational education equity coordinators (VEECs) essentially review decisions made by others. **AAUW urges Congress to clarify and consolidate the authority of the VEECs so that they, in fact, administer the set-asides: plan for the use and distribution of funds, and evaluate programs.**
- No method of allocation of set-aside funds is specified by the Perkins Act. Distributing funds by formula to all schools and colleges often results in amounts too small for effective programming. A competitive grants process can be used to identify and fund quality programs, while some funds are reserved for distribution to established service centers. **AAUW urges Congress to encourage states to use a discretionary funding process to distribute set-aside funds.**
- Under the Perkins Act, states may use set-aside funds for programs provided by community-based organizations (CBOs). However, some states limit or exclude from participation CBOs, who often have proven expertise in serving targeted populations. **AAUW urges Congress to encourage participation by CBOs in programs funded by the set-asides.**
- The Perkins Act allows states to use set-aside funds for support services such as child care and transportation for voc ed students. However, many states do not fund support services for prevocational students, who are learning basic skills needed to complete a voc ed program. **AAUW urges Congress to specify that support services can be provided for prevocational and vocational students.**

(over)

American
Association
of
University
Women

☐ 2401 Virginia Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC 20037 202/785-7712 ☐

- Under current law, women can become ineligible for all or part of subsistence benefits, such as food stamps or Aid to Families with Dependent Children, when they receive tuition assistance from a single parent or sex equity program. Financially disadvantaged women should not have to choose between decreased subsistence benefits and training for future employment. **AAUW urges Congress to ensure that women in programs funded by set-asides not lose subsistence benefits.**
- Oversight of sex equity and single parent programs is vital to ensure that the intent of the Perkins Act is being followed. Collection and analysis of data is necessary to accurately pinpoint problems and appropriate solutions. **AAUW urges Congress to conduct regular oversight visits, and require collection of data.**

November, 1988

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REAUTHORIZATION IN 1989

Based on the findings of this monitoring effort, Wider Opportunities for Women recommends that a number of provisions of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act be strengthened, clarified, or expanded to ensure that the program reaches its full potential. WOW's recommendations are listed below. Additional recommendations for state implementation are included in individual state reports.

WOW recommends the continuation of the set-asides for Sex Equity and Services to Single Parents and Homemakers at current levels. The number of new, innovative and expanded programs which were funded under the Perkins Act is evidence that sex equity dollars can be used to foster improvements in the education of women and girls. It is also clear that states will need continued support to institutionalize the programs and to clarify accountability and outcomes to improve vocational education for women and girls.

WOW recommends that the responsibilities and authority of the sex equity coordinator be clarified. In the Perkins Act, Congress assigned the task of administering the single parent/homemaker and sex equity set-asides to the sex equity coordinator. The intent was that the responsibility, accountability, and authority for the set-asides would rest with that position. Since implementation in Wisconsin, Illinois, and Indiana -- as well as in many other states -- has demonstrated that "administer" is open to vastly different interpretations, the language in the law and regulations must be clarified.

WOW recommends prohibition of excluding community-based organizations as direct or "partner" recipients for set-aside funding. Since the special populations defined in the Perkins Act sex equity set-asides are often being served in community- based organizations or may need services before entering a school environment, Congress recognized in 1984 that community-based organizations might be effective service deliverers or partners in service delivery with vocational education institutions. This practice can result in innovative approaches and avoids duplication of services. The law should prohibit state policy denying access to community-based organizations as deliverers or partners.

WOW recommends that states be prohibited from formula allocation of more than 50% of either sex equity set-aside, with the remaining 50% retained at the state level for development of innovative programming, requests for proposals or coordination efforts; and that states be prohibited from award of grants through formula allocation of less than $5,000 for set-aside activities. Retaining funds at the state level would provide states the flexibility to encourage innovative programming and increased coordination of services among agencies. Limiting the amount of money that can be awarded through formula would ensure that no area received too little money to support activities in keeping with the intent of the set-aside provisions.

WOW recommends that a standardized data collection process be used to collect state information on persons served, services delivered, program outcomes, and expenditures for the two sex equity set-asides. This system should document support services provided, whether paid for or leveraged through additional funds. To facilitate the process, a standardized set of forms could be designed through a national grant from the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education. The forms could be tested in selected states, refined, and used across the country, potentially in coordination with JTPA data collection efforts.

WOW recommends that allowable activities for use of 8.5% set-aside funds be expanded or clarified in the law or regulations to include:

- **** training and technical assistance for staff members of programs funded under the set-asides;**
- **** development and institutionalization of orientation, skills training, and other vocational education programs designed to increase the enrollment of single parents and homemakers in nontraditional vocational education programs;**
- **** provision of support services from entry into prevocational services through the transition to employment of women served in funded programs;**
- **** a wide range of pre-employment, placement and counseling services.**

State policies on the treatment of these pre-vocational and support services has varied greatly. Precluding support services until a program participant has completed part of a vocational program, or not allowing services to women who are not actually enrolled (e.g., counseling, recruitment) are examples. For many women, participation is not possible without these critical services. In addition, short term transition support services, such as those developed in the welfare legislation, could make the difference in the employability of women.

WOW recommends that allowable activities for the 3.5% set-aside funds be expanded to include:

- **** services for pre-secondary students including orientation, outreach, and other activities to increase their interest and enrollment in nontraditional vocational education programs.**

Without special outreach efforts, many young women will not consider education and training in nontraditional fields. Allowing funds to be used to promote nontraditional vocational education programs could increase enrollment in programs and, over the long term, increase women's wages.

For further information on these recommendations or on sex equity in these states, contact Wider Opportunities for Women, 1325 G Street NW, Washington, DC 20005. (202)638-3143.

The Vocational Education Equity Council
An Affilate Organization of the American Vocational Association

POSITION PAPER
on the
REAUTHORIZATION OF THE CARL PERKINS VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT
March 1989

Between 1989 and 2000, more than 80 percent of the new entrants into the labor force will be women, minorities (including immigrants), and individuals with disabilities. Overcoming the debilitating effects of race and sex role stereotyping are urgent issues if the nation is to enhance worker productivity, reduce welfare dependency, and maximize economic growth.

The Vocational Education Equity Council is a national organization comprised of individual and corporate members at the local, state and national levels. We have been assisting in the development and implementation of equitable policies, programs, and practices that promote opportunities in vocational-technical education for single parents/homemakers and at risk and females 14-25 years of age. This assures equal access to all vocational programs for both females and males. Based on the Council's interest in improving the quality of America's labor force and vocational education's role in workforce preparation endeavors, VEEC recommends that the existing sex equity and single parent/homemaker legislation as identified in the current Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act be reauthorized, specifically:

> **Assignment of one individual to work full time to administer vocational programs within the state to eliminate sex bias, sex role stereotyping and sex discrimination (including the single parent/homemaker and sex equity program setasides).**
>
> **Mandating a minimum state expenditure of $60,000 for sex equity administration.**
>
> **Maintaining setasides for special populations (Title II-A) as currently funded. Proposed redistribution flexibility, while well intended, becomes divisive among special population groups.**

Additionally, the following recommendations would serve to further strengthen equity issues within the current Act:

> **Guidance and counseling programs funded under the Act shall infuse sex equity concepts into all activities.**
>
> **Vocational student leadership development activities shall include awareness of strategies to overcome race and sex role stereotyping in vocational education and the world of work.**
>
> **Research in vocational-technical education shall include programs to assist vocational educators and students in overcoming barriers imposed by gender, race, ethnicity and handicapping condition.**
>
> **Curriculum developed with federal vocational education funds shall be non-biased materials.**

Mandate that the State Council on Vocational Education include members who are knowledgeable about the special vocational needs of women and single parents.

Require the State Vocational Sex Equity Coordinator report to the State Director of Vocational Education and sign off on the State Plan to assure the state's commitment to equity in vocational education.

The Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984 charged vocational education with the responsibility to provide quality training opportunities that lead to jobs and to ensure that traditionally underserved individuals receive services. As a result of the single parent/homemaker setaside, some 298,097 individuals nationwide in FY 87 alone received vocational education training and services that enabled them to better support themselves and their families. The sex equity setaside has also proven to be useful in expanding the career and educational aspirations of at-risk females. Vocational sex equity efforts begun in 1976 and expanded in 1984 by the Perkins Act have been successful in providing programs which address changing workforce demographics and are an important component in strengthening the self-sufficiency of American families.

The Vocational Education Equity Council **strongly urges** Congress that reauthorization of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Act contain, unchanged, the vocational sex equity requirements and setaside provisions.

APPENDIX R

Selected Reports and Studies in Vocational Education Impacting Sex Equity

Advocates for Sex Equity in Federal Education Law: The National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education (50)

Millsap, Unpublished Doctoral Thesis

Mary Ann Millsap who completed her doctorate at Harvard selected the title listed above for her thesis. Her in-depth study of the Coalition traces its history and major contributions to all aspects of sex equity in education and includes chapters on the vocational education legislation. Anyone desiring detailed information on the Coalition should refer to this study.

A Unification of Forces: Coalition Works for Sex Equity in Education (24)

Dunkle, Voc Ed, April, 1980

The National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education was formed in 1975 and brought together a heterogeneous group of professional, educational, advocacy women's organizations and civil rights groups. The impetus to mobilize came from the threat that the U.S. Congress would reject the regulations to implement Title IX of the 1972 Education Amendments. In essence it was "the unification of the forces committed to eliminating sex discrimination and bias in education throughout the country" (p. 43). In an article written by Margaret Dunkle, former chair of the Coalition, she indicated that the "Coalition came into existence because a vehicle was needed to provide a collective political response to an important governmental policy" (p. 43). Over 50 organizations participated in the Coalition.

Title IX was the first campaign for the Coalition but the membership knew that Title IX enforcement policies were not the only answer to sex bias and discrimination in education and the work place. Subsequently, the reauthorization of the Vocational Education Act was before Congress had provided an opportunity to address sex equity issues from a programmatic perspective. No group has had a greater impact on the sex equity provisions of the vocational education legislation in the past decade than the NCWGE.

Biennial Report of the State Council on Vocational Technical Education - Minnesota (52)

The 1987 Biennial Report of the State Council on Vocational Technical Education in Minnesota was noteworthy for its format. Commendations were given to five other agencies and institutions in the state that had made significant contributions to vocational education. Also, the report included major papers presented at state conferences, communication projects and special honors presented to students and others for their contributions to vocational education.

"Equity for Targeted Populations in Vocational Technical Education: Report and Recommendations, 1987" was one topic explored in the report on page 13. Single parents, displaced homemakers and participants in programs to eliminate sex bias and stereotyping were included in the "targeted" groups. General recommendations were presented for all targeted populations, but the specific needs of each group were not explored.

Center for Women's Policy Studies (CWPS): The First 15 Years (15)

October, 1987

One of the four critical issues to which the Center for Women Policy Studies gave its attention, since its inception in 1972, was the area of women and work. The focus was on employment discrimination, harassment of women in the work place, occupational segregation, the earnings gap, and women in non-traditional employment. The expertise and leadership provided by the Center was important in lobbying for changes in vocational education. The Center produced many materials and data which were needed in identifying problems of women in the work place. For example, in 1988, one of the Center's objectives was to "seek to define more explicitly the connections among women's educational opportunities, economic status, family roles and employment opportunities" (p. 1-80d). Issues related to women of color were to receive priority.

CWPS, as a member of the Coalition, was involved in the support of the federal vocational legislation. Numerous symposia were held throughout the years to address issues in sex equity. The Center's emphasis on policy has had a significant impact on the social, legal and economic status of women in this country.

Increasing Sex Equity: The Impact of the 1976 Vocational Amendments on Sex Equity in Vocational Education (54)
Report by NACVE and NACWEP

The joint effort of the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education and the National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs initiated in September, 1979 resulted in a comprehensive study of the impact of the 1976 Amendments, as related to the equity provisions in the law. Information and data were compiled, interviews and a meeting were held with state sex equity coordinators, and public hearings were held to discuss critical issues.

An analysis was made of state plans and accountability reports in fifteen states. The conclusion was that the:

> ... implementation of the sex equity provisions varied, and sometimes correlated with improved enrollment patterns. It appears that the achievements of sex equity requires not only the commitment of major funding, but also the establishment of an entire system that requires, as well as encourages, such planning activity (p. 26).

The second phase of the study was a review of the research; namely two major studies, (a) Volumes 1 and 2 of the Vocational Education Equity Study, and (b) The Planning Papers for the Vocational Education Study issued by NIE. The report concluded that these studies might be useful in strengthening subsequent legislation but the specifics should be reviewed with caution since the data is an affirmation of the problems the legislation was designed to correct (p. 40).

Two public hearings were held by the Councils in May, 1980. Issues of concern to the Councils were: funding, sex equity, special needs of women, post-secondary education, the role of sex equity coordinators, public hearings on the State Plans, attitudes and training of vocational education personnel, and the impact of related legislation (p. 46). Additional concerns resulting from the hearings were the need for services and programs for displaced homemakers and minority and adult women, attitudes of parents and peers, and that sex equity include accessibility for both sexes (p. 47).

This was an important report and was used as the basis of testimony during the reauthorization hearings prior to the passage of the Carl Perkins Act. The Executive Summary contained an overview of the major findings and can be found in the Appendix of this document. In general, the results support the fact that effort reaps rewards; that is, those who take the extra steps create change. Enrollment shifts are greatest in adult and post-secondary programs (more women in non-traditional programs) and states need to emphasize activities to overcome sex bias and stereotyping in addition to monitoring and reviewing programs and plans (p. i - ii). States responded to the legislation but did little else to effect change. The intent to "do something" was clear but there was little information available to evaluate progress and identify specific programs and services developed by the states.

> Greatest increases in enrollment of women in non-traditional programs occurred in states where planning and monitoring systems were established to meet equity goals, where funds were committed to establish equity programs, and where efforts were made to utilize the entire state staff to address sex equity issues (p. v).

The public hearings were critical in that additional concerns not previously addressed by the Council were identified. Specific needs of displaced and working mothers (ie., child care) were stressed by those testifying. Key was the recommendation that "sex equity must be viewed as a human issue that affects men as well as women" (p. vi).

'It's (Past) Time to Unstereotype!' (27)

Eliason, School Shop, 1977

Another long time advocate for women's issues was Nancy Carol Eliason. When she was Director of the Center for Women's Opportunities, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, she wrote an article for the magazine School Shop (June, 1977 reprint).

> 'It's (Past) Time to Unstereotype!' conveyed the plain fact that women who have broken into the traditional male occupations, particularly those at higher pay levels, represent such a small percentage of the total women in the work force as to be statistically insignificant (p. 1).

She stressed that the primary reason for women entering the work force is an economic one and "jobs without advancement potential are usually jobs without economic growth" (p. 2). Her plea was to "unstereotype" both the "atmosphere of technical training and career counseling for female students" (p. 2). She believed that American technical institutions were confronting a "quiet female revolution".

National Agenda for Vocational Education (4)
by AVA

In preparation for making recommendations for the 1982 reauthorization of the Vocational Education Act, AVA engaged in an extensive study to prepare a National Agenda for Vocational Education. This June, 1981 report highlighted the potential contribution of vocational education to selected national goals and concerns. Part F of the report "Responding to the Nation's Equity Goals," one of the ten topics studied, states that:

> Vocational education is a crucial instrument for creating access to better jobs for those who in the past have been denied because of race, sex, national origin or other disadvantage. All forms of discrimination or disadvantage in occupational or employment-related education and training can be overcome if vocational education is given the capacity to provide individuals with the support service they need to succeed (p. 40).

Statistical data were provided in the following areas: number of women in work, reasons why women must work, number of single-person households and those headed by women, pay disparity, occupational segregation, and enrollments in non-traditional occupations.

The report continued:

> Vocational education can play a significant role in preparing women to enter nontraditional fields, but it cannot act in isolation. Most authorities agree that sex-role socialization begins at birth and that simple imitation, direct reinforcement and cognitive development are important determinants of values and behavior (p. 40).

To support its position, the Agenda cited statements from the AIR study:

> The AIR Study concluded that nontraditional role models would stimulate interest in enrollments in nontraditional courses. However, it is likely that dramatic improvement in enrollments of women in nontraditional occupational programs can be achieved by concentrating on recruiting older women seeking better paying jobs and women seeking to enter or reenter the work force (p. 43).

The AIR Study found that where a concerted effort was made to focus on nontraditional occupational career choices, more students enrolled in nontraditional programs. However, little more than one-third of the 100 schools in the study actively sponsored programs related to sex equity and both teachers and counselors employed in schools reflected traditional patterns (p. 43).

Recommendations for reauthorization included more funding for displaced homemakers, special services, grants for developing and testing equity services, civil rights compliance and technical assistance, administration, fellowships, services to rural areas, school-to-work transition, joint education programs, and consumer and homemaking programs (p. 48).

The Agenda supported the need for state leadership by sex equity coordinators, technical assistance, worksite learning, joint efforts among all educational programs and funds to hire staff at HEW to ensure compliance (p. 47-48). It was recommended that reauthorization legislation require that federal funds be directed toward the priorities of quality, accessibility, equality of opportunity and economic development.

A summary statement showed the hesitancy of AVA to be bold and the concern felt for maintaining its image of vocational education.

> The reauthorizing legislation should provide the resources to enable vocational education to offer all individuals equal opportunity to understand, to consider, to choose and to pursue traditional and nontraditional occupational programs. The resources must be sufficient to provide the extra services which enable disadvantaged and handicapped individuals to succeed -- outreach, assessment, related basic skills training, counseling and extra time. Vocational education can then be held accountable for the quality of efforts expended to assure all individuals equal access and equal success in its programs. It is unreasonable to expect vocational education to achieve perfect equity for its graduates in the labor market. There are too many variables at work to make this possible, including the right of individuals to chart their own destiny. Holding education accountable for an equal proportion of male/female or minority/majority in each program area can only result in the loss of individual liberty (p. 49).

National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs: Annual Reports (55)

The National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs, issued a series of Annual Reports which included their concerns about sex equity in vocational education. In 1976, the Council designated vocational education as a priority area for its attention and focused efforts on the revision of the Federal legislation.

The Council analyzed the Senate and House bills and disseminated information to Congress and national organizations about women's issues (p. 4). Members worked with OE in writing the new regulations, distributed information about public meetings to be held in each state, made suggestions for priorities in vocational education and submitted recommendations to OE regarding priorities in research and project evaluation.

One of the Council's major contributions was the development of a six-page, easily read, summary of the major provisions of the '76 Act. This was shared with sex equity coordinators and many others who requested copies (p. 8).

Late in 1977, the Council undertook an "unprecedented cooperative effort" with the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education to form a Task Force on Sex Equity in Vocational Education (p. 8). The purpose was to assist state sex equity coordinators in carrying out their duties. Subsequently, the two groups developed a two-phase study. Phase I was to: (a) review and analyze the results of studies/projects to determine the effectiveness of sex equity provisions in the law, (b) suggest changes for subsequent legislation, (c) determine how the law was being implemented, and (d) assess how policy was being effected by agencies and groups that work within the vocational education structure. Phase II consisted of regional public hearings and forums to gather information and promote public interest on sex equity issues. This report is discussed elsewhere in more detail.

The Council was able to report in its Sixth Annual Report (March, 1981) that this joint effort had resulted in the publication of a document, Improving Sex Equity: The Impact of the 1976 Vocational Amendments on Sex Equity in Vocational Education (p. 9).

Following is a brief summary of findings:

> Information contained in state reports and from enrollment data, clearly indicated that there was a rapid expansion in enrollment of women in vocational education programs between 1972 and 1978; and that a shift in women's concentration from traditional (clerical, beauty culture, health services) to mixed programs (business and office, data processing, accounting, real estate sales, hotel and motel) is occurring. Some slight increase of women in non-traditional programs was also found. In general, significant progress toward sex equity was attained only when there was a commitment of major funding, detailed planning, monitoring systems, and a commitment on the part of the entire state staff to address sex equity issues. Data from the American Institutes for Research study also showed that schools which made major efforts to recognize and rectify inequities had a higher proportion of non-traditional students.
>
> The Council's two public hearings identified additional issues for discussion of the Federal role in the elimination of sex discrimination and sex stereotyping in vocational education. The information in this study will assist the Councils in determining which provisions of the legislation should be reauthorized, modified or deleted, and which new provisions might be added (p. 9).

In late December, 1981, the Council reported to Congress on its activities -- which is a mandated function of the Council. Vice Chair Virginia Foxx and Christine Long of NACVE presented the results of the joint project/study to the House Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education.

> Both Councils strongly recommended to Congress that continued national, state and local efforts are essential to eliminate sex discrimination, bias and stereotyping and to ensure the progress necessary for women and the country as a whole. The Council testimony noted that the law can and must be simplified, and also detailed several other specific changes and critical emphases for the reauthorized law (p. 20).

Equity in the Midwest (149)

by WOW

Wider Opportunities for Women, Inc. (WOW), a Washington, DC based organization dedicated to the achievement of equal opportunities for women, worked with the National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education and the state SECs to strengthen the position of women and girls in the vocational system. WOW played a major role in the passage of the Carl Perkins Act and conducted studies to monitor state implementation of the sex equity provisions.

In the Spring, 1985, WOW completed a survey of 17 states and found that about one-third of the states surveyed appeared to be in full compliance with the sex equity provisions of the Act; one-third in partial compliance; and about one-third were not in compliance.

WOW also undertook a major study of Equity in the Midwest which included the states of Illinois, Indiana and Wisconsin. Financial support for the study was obtained from the Joyce Foundation and the Rockefeller Family Fund. The study, a comparative analysis of the implementation of the Carl Perkins Act in these states, resulted in recommendations for reauthorization and contained short profiles of innovative programs. The findings were relatively positive.

Specific recommendations for reauthorization in 1989 by WOW can be found in the Appendix.

Recommended Framework for the Reauthorization of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (5)
by AVA

The following is a summary from the introduction of the AVA's recommended framework for reauthorization of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (November 25, 1981).

The American Vocational Association (AVA) has engaged in an extensive study of vocational education in preparation for making recommendations for the 1982 reauthorization of the Vocational Education Act. The study involved ten legislative study teams composed of 100 vocational educators from around the country. In addition, leaders from business, industry, and labor participated on several of the teams.

The teams studied the following topics: the basis for federal investment in vocational education; basic state grant programs; special populations; youth and adults; programs of state and national improvement; planning and evaluation; sex equity; financing vocational education; administration of vocational education and consumer and homemaking education. Attention was given to the contemporary influences of social, economic, technological and educational changes on the future course of vocational education. The leaders of the study teams operated as a task force to synthesize the findings and observations of their study teams into the final document.

The purpose of the report was to provide a framework, establishing both direction and boundaries for new vocational education legislation. The report addressed AVA's view on major new provisions needed to improve existing programs in light of changing needs (p. 1).

The primary purposes of the legislation, as outlined in this paper, did not speak to sex equity specifically, but did cite the need to overcome discrimination. For example, it stated that there was a need to conduct quality employment-related education programs that will "overcome all forms of discrimination or disadvantage related to sex, race, age, national origin, physical or mental handicap, educational and economic disadvantage and geographic location" (p. 3).

The practice of identifying discrimination and disadvantaged as related issues, by AVA, continued and was cited as a reason for a federal investment in vocational education.

> Equality of Opportunity. Providing individually tailored special services to enable certain individuals to participate in and succeed through vocational education is a national priority. Special services are needed to aid those individuals who are educationally, economically and physically disadvantaged to successfully enter and complete vocational education to make the transition into a job. Overcoming the effect of discrimination on the basis of sex, race, and

> geographic location also requires special services. Such services enable persons previously discriminated against the opportunity to choose and successfully participate in the full range of vocational education programs (p. 4).

Continuation of the position of sex equity coordinator was recommended:

> The sex equity coordinator position should be continued to perform the functions outlined in the current vocational education law. Vocational education has made substantial progress in removing perceived stereotyping from programs since the 1976 Amendments. Future efforts must build on the work already begun. Increased emphasis must be placed on improving pre-vocational guidance and counseling services designed to help potential students make career choices based on interests and aptitudes rather than on "expected" sex-related roles (p. 6).

Another recommendation related to equity was that the state and local planning process should "(3) enable individuals to make considered choices either to accept or reject nontraditional enrollments" (p. 7). Sex equity was not mentioned as a priority in evaluation, reporting and accountability procedures; and was not included in special initiatives or national programs. A brief reference was made to sex equity under the heading Special Populations, as a suggested activity; "Initiate improved information and counseling services designed to eliminate sex and racial stereotyping" (p. 12).

Sex Equity in Vocational Education: A Policy Paper for Reauthorization (148)

VEEC and State SEC's

The Vocational Education Equity Council (VEEC) and State Sex Equity Coordinators prepared a joint paper, "Sex Equity in Vocational Education: A Policy Paper for Reauthorization," in October, 1981. The paper presented an overview of sex equity issues, identified efforts that have been made by the states, and recommendations for provisions to be included in the reauthorized Vocational Education Amendments (p. 3). The need for change in vocational education was supported with data about families, employees and employers (p. 4-9). Nineteen recommendations were presented which focused on the following:

1) The Vocational Education Amendments should continue to promote sex equity in planning, programming and funding actions beyond "equal access".
2) Funding and program requirements for sex equity should be integrated into the entire vocational education system for greatest effectiveness;
3) Sex equity efforts continue to need representatives in each state: sex equity coordinators, members of state and local advisory councils, and members of state planning committees;
4) Vocational education funds need to be targeted to meet the needs of special groups such as displaced homemakers, pregnant teenagers, single heads of households and the elderly (p. 10).

A major contribution of this paper was the inclusion of a specific definition for sex equity, which was not provided in the Regulations for the '76 Amendments.

> Sex equity is fair and just treatment of individuals, which allows them to choose educational programs and occupational careers, to enter programs and careers according to their interests and abilities, and permits them to participate fully in and to benefit fully from those programs without regard to their sex (p. 11).

The request of the coordinators as outlined in this paper was not excessive and was in tune with the '76 Act. Two additional suggestions were: funding for special groups and opening-up the criteria for use of vocational monies for sex equity activities.

Sex Equity Issues in the Reauthorization of the Vocational Education Act: A Survey of State Vocational Education Directors (86)

Miller, Federal Education Project

The Federal Education Project of the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law published a report of a survey of state directors of vocational education in July, 1982. The survey was funded by a grant from the Ford Foundation and the author of the report was Debra Miller.

The project came about, partially, in response to Senator Hatch's call for more information about women in vocational education programs; plus a desire to learn what state vocational leaders could suggest as alternatives to existing legislation in order to inspire more state and local support of sex equity programs.

The study included nineteen state directors (or their representatives) who were interviewed by telephone in the summer of 1982. A survey form with 18 questions was used to obtain uniformity in responses. The NASDVE had released a position paper on the reauthorization of the Vocational Education Act but this survey solicited opinions regarding specific ways to achieve greater equity for females. The major findings follow:

- A majority of directors interviewed recommended retention of the current federal provisions for sex equity in vocational education.
- A majority of directors interviewed could not suggest any alternative methods of promoting or increasing sex equity in vocational education.
- Half of the directors interviewed considered the few years since the 1976 amendments to the Vocational Education Act to be too short a period in which to conclude that state efforts to overcome ingrained sex-biased attitudes in vocational education have failed.
- The majority of directors interviewed were opposed to a block grant for vocational education.
- Approximately one-third of the directors interviewed believed that their state will reduce sex equity efforts if Congress passes a block grant for vocational education without the current sex equity provisions; another third thought that reduced efforts are a possibility for their state, especially if there are more budget cuts.
- A majority of directors interviewed thought that their state probably or definitely would not continue to employ a full-time sex equity coordinator if Congress passed a block grant for vocational education.
- A majority of directors interviewed agreed that more state efforts are necessary to address equity for women in vocational education, especially in the area of training for traditionally male jobs.
- The majority of directors interviewed said their state was currently either increasing or holding constant its sex equity funding and efforts.

The consensus of opinion among the directors was:

> Because of the fiscal pressures on states and the view that sex equity remains a national priority, many state directors concurred that sex equity in vocational education, in the words of one director, "it's not going to happen unless they mandate it" in federal law (p. 278).

A majority (12) of directors interviewed could not suggest other ways of increasing or promotion sex equity than those specified in the law. Six suggested that the federal mandates be retained but geared to giving more flexibility and less accountability to states (p. 296).

The Unfinished Agenda: The Role of Vocational Education in the High School (65)

National Commission on Secondary Vocational Education

The National Commission on Secondary Vocational Education formed in January, 1984, examined the role and function of secondary education in the nation. The final report of the Commission, The Unfinished Agenda: The Role of Vocational Education in the High School concerned itself with major issues of quality, equity, relationships, and expectations. The Commission questioned recent studies on education that recommended improving the quality of education by requiring more academics and ignoring the differences in student interest and abilities. The report stressed that the concept of "more" may not be as important as "diversity" in achieving excellence in secondary schools (p. 1). (Author's note: But "more" may be less expensive than "diversity".)

The Commission reported that:

> ... sex-linked enrollment patterns in vocational courses resist most efforts to change them -- males still are found mostly in such areas as trades and industrial, and females in office and clerical. These gender biases reflect ingrained societal attitudes held in the family and in the workplace that vocational education cannot directly affect. Nonetheless, vocational programs and guidance services need to place more emphasis on redressing issues of sex bias and equity, comparable pay, discrimination in the workplace, and the problems of multiple wage-earner families (p. 11).

Cited as outcomes of vocational education were the following:

- Among males, twice as many vocational concentrators as nonvocational graduates worked in craft occupations (33% vs. 15%).
- Among females, 61% of vocational concentrators worked in clerical occupations whereas 37% of nonvocational graduates did (p. 30).

The Commission's recommendations for equity were four in number.

- State and local school officials must guarantee educational equity in their schools. This includes full participation of special population youth and potential dropouts.
- Schools should not provide separate tracks that lead to distinct diplomas.
- States and local districts should undertake the use of individualized employability development plans with all students to coordinate instructional support services and career planning.

> - School administrators, counselors and vocational teachers must guarantee that males and females have equal access to and are recruited for all vocational offerings. Information on sex bias, stereotyping and discrimination must be incorporated into the instructional program and guidance services' (p. 25).

Recommendations in the areas of curriculum, teacher preparation, leadership, etc. did not refer to equity. Therefore, the issue was not seen as an integral part of all aspects of vocational education, even by this group. It is worth noting that there were three women on the fourteen member Commission, Marion B. W. Holmes, Executive Director for Career and Vocational Education, School District of Philadelphia; Ruth P. Hughes, Distinguished Professor and Head of Home Economics, Iowa State University; and Beatrice G. Reubens, Senior Research Associate with Conservation of Human Resources, Columbia University.

Update: A Guide for Vocational Education Sex Equity Personnel (138)
Vetter and Richey (NCRVE)

The NCRVE developed A Guide for Vocational Education Sex Equity Personnel in an effort to provide states with assistance in implementing the Carl Perkins Act. A similar guide had been prepared after the passage of the '76 Amendments (Vetter, Burkhardt and Sechler, 1978). Included in the recent guide was a discussion of current concerns as identified by sex equity coordinators. One of these concerns related to the series of "excellence" reports for changing education. Suffice it to say, vocational education has felt the results of these reports as schools have reevaluated their programs and changed their requirements for graduation.

The guide goes on to cite the review of reform reports made by Tetreault and Schmuck (1985).

> The reform books and commissioned reports selected for our analysis clearly indicate that the past decade of legislation new scholarship on women, research and action for sex equity in schools has gone unheeded. Gender is not a relevant category in the analysis of excellence in schools. When gender was considered, it appears to merely embellish the traditional--and male -- portrait of the school. The proposed vision for excellence in the schools is of education for the male student in the public and productive sphere. Because gender, as a relevant concept is absent, even Title IX is ignored. Issues of gender in relation to policy, students, curricula, and faculty are not identified nor treated as educational problems to be solved. The goal of excellence does not even have the female student in mind (p. 63).

Both of the guides for SEC's were produced under the direction of Dr. Louise Vetter, long-time advocate and researcher in sex equity at the NCRVE (and consultant for this study).

Vocational Education: A Look to the Future (106)
Ruff, Shylo and Russell (NCRVE)

The Ohio State University NCRVE published a document in January, 1981 entitled, Vocational Education: A Look Into the Future. It was a study of possible futures for vocational education and attempted to isolate and analyze the factors that are likely to influence the field in the 1980s and to suggest decisions which might bring about desired outcomes (p. ix). The document was reviewed to determine if sex equity was cited as a future concern for vocational education.

The study investigated how current and future policies and trends would affect six major areas, with sex stereotyping identified as one of these areas. It was projected that progress would continue to be made in eliminating sex bias and sex stereotyping in the 80s and that the federal government would maintain its emphasis in this area. However, responsibility would move to the state and local levels during the decade. Although programs did not enroll males and females in equal numbers, sex stereotyping was not the primary reason for the discrepancy (p. 46). For example, changes occurred in the business and health occupations when more men took jobs in these fields. As a result, jobs were upgraded. (Men make the impact!)

Two other factors which contributed to the reduction of sex bias and stereotyping were:

> ... labor shortages that occurred in some occupations and areas of the country, and the increased number of women sought occupational training ... as a matter of family economics, it was accepted that women would work outside the home (p. 47).

By the end of the decade,much of the emotionalism surrounding equity issues was gone! Legislation guaranteed the rights of women and encouraged the recruitment of non-traditional students. As school-age student numbers decreased, institutions were aggressive in recruiting non-traditional students. Support services were expanded. The efforts to erase sexism in the larger society were felt. However,

> ... the movement was dealt two blows. The conservative shift in the national outlook during the early 1980s slowed the process slightly; second, increased competition for middle management positions among older workers led to a backlash against women who held or sought management positions (p. 47).

The report presented two scenarios for the elimination of sex bias:

1) The shift to on-site training was a plus because it impacted fair hiring practices and increased pressure on employers to respond to equal opportunity and affirmative action legislation. This approach helped the non-traditional students who encountered difficulty in coping with the stress associated with entering non-traditional jobs.

More displaced homemakers were attracted to non-traditional occupations and more support services were provided at the work site. Also, enrollment in short-term training programs reflected a more equal distribution of males and females (p. 53).

2) The shift in federal funds for adult and short-term training had little impact on eliminating sex bias and stereotyping. Attitudes of industrial personnel bordered on resentment toward upwardly aspiring women, especially during slow down and down turns in the economy. Business and industry had to recruit and support women (eg., child care) while contending with changing attitudes toward the role of women in the work force (p. 58).

The biggest gains for women were in the new occupations that had not been stereotyped and where labor shortages existed. Short-term training was not a factor in reducing sex bias (p. 58).

Vocational Education: Cause or Cure for Youth Unemployment (58)
NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund

The NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund, Inc. was one of the groups that conducted several activities in the late 1970s related to the implementation of the Act at the Federal level, in several states and in one local district. (From correspondence with Phyllis McClure, a member of the staff. Ms. McClure was cited by numerous people as a champion for all minorities and an influential person on the Washington scene.) An example of the Fund's activities can be found in a report to the citizens of Oakland, California in 1981 entitled, Vocational Education: Cause or Cure for Youth Unemployment?, which included a chapter on "Sex Equity in Vocational Education: Who Cares?" Findings in the report regarding sex equity were twofold:

1) Federal requirements to reduce sex bias and stereotyping in vocational education are given little attention by Oakland school officials.

2) Less than 1% of federal funds for vocational education is spent on promoting sex equity and equal access compared with 65.3% which is spent on sex stereotyped vocational classes (p. 20).

Traditional attitudes about "proper" work for men and women were cited as a deterrent to equal access. Local educators blamed parents, students and teachers; but the study indicated that these attitudes also existed within the higher administration (p. 22). Final recommendations included a statement on eliminating sex bias and actively recruiting boys and girls for non-traditional courses (p. 24).

Vocational Education Equity Study (21, 38)
by AIR

The law mandated that the U.S. Commissioner of Education conduct a study to determine the extent of sex discrimination and sex stereotyping in vocational education and document progress made to overcome this problem. The American Institutes for Research (AIR) was awarded the contract for the study. Steiger, Fink and Kosecoff, Inc. and L. Miranda and Associates were subcontractors. The total study involved all 50 states and 100 schools at all levels.

Volume I, completed by SFK presented a picture of how labor force participation by women is becoming more like men's, but their wages and job choice are not. The study reinforced the fact that while women had penetrated most areas of the labor force in greater numbers than ever before, they continued to cluster in a disproportionately large way in a few, relatively low paying occupations traditional for their sex.

> ... Women so far have failed to penetrate in any significant way many of the best paying industrial job categories which traditionally have been dominated by men and for which vocational education represents an important entry point (p. 5).

The researchers constructed an index to highlight those occupations which led the labor force as a whole in employing women and those which lagged behind from 1960 to 1977.

The study included a look at student aspirations and perceptions and found perpetuation of traditional sex role patterns. Students' career plans were influenced primarily by self, parents and peers, with teachers being more influential than counselors. Exposure to opportunities was the single most important factor in choice reported by one study. Contrary to the traditional beliefs held by most, both male and female students believe women should work to help support the household. Local studies pointed out that both students and staff have a low level of awareness of sex inequities within schools and classes.

Enrollment statistics revealed a gradual increase in student enrollment in programs not traditional for their sex, but change had been very slow. The report indicated that a few studies found that students themselves, not teachers or counselors, initiated the non-traditional choice.

Chapter IV of the report consisted of Legislative Provisions to Eliminate Sex Bias, Sex Discrimination, and Sex Stereotyping in Vocational Education. This four year history showed that there was mounting agreement that a significant problem existed and it must be remedied. Recommendations for change were: (1) increase the number of women in higher paying traditional male jobs, and (2) provide higher pay for traditional female jobs. It was pointed out that most of the legislative, advocacy and implementation initiative focused on the former with little attention to the latter (p. 38).

Vocational Education Study: The Interim Report (67)

by NIE

> Title V, Section 523 (b), of the Education Amendments of 1976 (P.L. 94-482) charges the National Institute of Education (NIE) with undertaking a study of vocational education and related programs, including inquiries into (1) the distribution of vocational education funds, (2) compliance with the applicable laws of the United States, (3) the means of assessing program quality and effectiveness, and (4) consumer and homemaking education programs (p. xi).

The law required a final report by September 30, 1981 and an interim report a year earlier. Dr. Henry David became the project director and Gerry Henrickson was his assistant.

Federal vocational education legislation, beginning in 1917 with the Smith-Hughes Act, changed throughout the years especially in 1963 and 1968 when concern for persons with special needs was included in the legislation. The '76 Amendments expanded the emphasis on special needs groups and added "another equity commitment, to reduce sex bias and sex-role stereotyping in vocational education" (p. xiii).

Congress responded to the well-organized and well-presented testimony of women's groups. The testimony focused on the disparity in salaries, and concentration of women in low-paying occupations. During hearings, both the House and Senate were presented with evidence and reports regarding the high degree of sex bias and stereotyping in curriculum, counseling, and attitudes of teachers in vocational education. Conclusions drawn were that women must seek non-traditional employment if they want higher wages, and vocational education programs reinforce traditional practices (p. ii-24).

Both Houses were so concerned about the problem that they became determined to use Federal legislation to change the system. They viewed the problem to be of such magnitude that it became one of the three major improvements to be addressed in the legislation (p. ii-15). As a result, the Declaration of Purpose in the Act was rewritten to include the area of sex equity (p. ii-24).

Although sex equity is cited throughout the Act, the most prominent and controversial provision was the establishment of the position of sex equity coordinator in each state. It was the only one involving a mandatory expenditure of funds for full time personnel to carry out the sex bias related provisions of the Act (p. ii-24).

The tasks assigned to the sex equity coordinator were formidable and were spelled out in a job description. This was another first.

> The sex equity provisions introduced in 1976 are a departure from traditional Federal vocational education policy, in that they seek to alter, rather than respond to changes in, the labor market (p. ii-25).

The sex equity coordinator was not a member of the State Planning Committee. The only role he/she served in the process was review and sign-off. The sign-off requirement was an attempt, through the planning process, to make the system responsive to a constituency. It is unique in that the sex equity coordinator was the only representative of a special needs constituency given this specified, though limited, function.

None of the sex equity coordinators in the states sampled for the study refused to sign off on the state plan but some requested changes in the wording of the plan. One coordinator stated:

> It would take something very big to make me refuse my signature. After all, I'm supposed to work in this place and within the system. It wouldn't be a constructive thing to do (p. iv-13).

The final report by NIE provided more details on the sex equity issue. None of the subcontracted, extramural research studies were available when the Interim Report was written.

Vocational Preparation of Women (115)
Report of Secretary's Advisory Committee on the Rights and Responsibilities of Women

The Vocational Preparation of Women (by Steiger and Cooper, that was published in July, 1975) was the title given to a report written for the Secretary's [HEW] Advisory Committee on the Rights and Responsibilities of Women. It came down hard on women and employment issues, especially the concentration of women in low-paying occupations, and the limited number of targeted programs for women.

HEW came under heavy fire for its lack of concern for women's issues, its abysmal record keeping on funded projects, and the scope of the few projects addressing sex equity.

The Advisory Council's recommendations fell into the following categories: (1) amendments to the bill offered by the Administration, and (2) HEW's policy and practice regarding women in leadership roles. Increased funding, dissemination of research findings, better record keeping and more attention to curriculum, materials, guidance and inservice training to eliminate sex related problems were recommended (p. 5-7). Also, it was suggested that HEW practice what it preached.

A key legislative recommendation related to the development of the Statement of Purpose in the law.

> A clear declaration that it is the intent of the law to provide equal opportunity for vocational education to both sexes and to overcome barriers to such equal opportunity should be added to the statement of purpose (p. 5).

Vocational Special Needs Learners: Five Years of Research and Development (17)

Ciccone and Friedenberg (NCRVE)

A review and synthesis of the last five years (1984-1988) of the major literature related to encouraging non-traditional options and single parents' and homemakers' issues were prepared by Dr. Louise Vetter of the NCRVE (76). The project, Serving the Needs of Special Populations: The Last Five Years of Vocational Research and Development, was funded by the USDOE, Office of Adult and Vocational Education.

The in-depth review provides much information and presents conclusions regarding progress and lack of data to assess results of programs and services in these areas (p. 145-216). A summary of that report follows:

> In the fifth chapter, Dr. Louise Vetter, in examining the field of non-traditional options in vocational education, found that both number and percentage of female students have increased in such traditionally male programs as agriculture, technical, and trade and industry. In occupational home economics and office occupations, which are traditionally female programs, there is an increase in male student enrollment. Despite these pluses, however, within these categories, the growth is in good part due to increased enrollment of women in such traditional programs as cosmetology (categorized in trade and industry) and in data processing (technical), although there are some increases in such trade and industry areas as commercial photography, drafting, graphic arts, and law enforcement programs (Project on Equal Educational Rights, 1986). The most noteworthy advance for women in office occupations is in supervisory and administrative management -- women now encompass over half the students enrolled in this program, as compared to one-quarter in 1971 (Division of Vocational and Technical Education, 1973; U.S. Department of Education, 1984).
>
> Of the available research, Vetter indicates that much of it is focused on the recruitment of students into nontraditional programs. Much less information is available on the retention of students through the programs, and even less information is available on the placement of students in jobs.
>
> There was sufficient information, however, to document the fact that short-term, one-shot programs to attract nontraditional enrollment are well received but do not seem to lead to higher enrollments in nontraditional programs or courses at the secondary level. Longer term, more comprehensive programs appear necessary to increase actual change in interest and confidence of success in nontraditional careers.

In terms of outcomes of participation in nontraditional programs, two significant follow up studies (Hargrave, Frazier & Thomas, 1983; Smith, 1982) of men and women enrolling in such programs found that women employed in traditionally male occupations earned significantly higher wages than women employed in traditionally female occupations, although they still earned significantly lower wages than men employed in these occupations.

Vetter also prepared the sixth chapter on single parents and displaced homemakers, in which she identifies the comprehensive services needed by this target group in order to have an optimal program. Beyond this, however, she found that adequate information for a national overview of programs serving displaced homemakers has never been collected and that [data] about factors contributing to program success or failure is unavailable. The state sex equity coordinators have begun national data collection efforts on such [variables] as client characteristics, services provided, outcomes, and follow-up results. This data collection system should be continued.

On the subject of funding, Vetter indicated that in states where funds are allocated on a formula basis through the Perkins Act to aid single parents and displaced homemakers, the amount received by districts or institutions is often so small that special programming cannot be implemented. In such cases, she recommends that allocation be made based on requests for proposals rather than on formulas.

VOC ED Journal: April, 1980 (6)
Issues Related to Sex Equity

This particular issue of VOC ED was a long time coming and served to promote and explain the equity issue to a large segment of the vocational community. It highlighted some major areas of concern: (a) sex-biased materials, (b) the importance of teachers as leaders in affecting change, (c) bringing sex-fairness to vocational assessment inventories, (d) the need for both sexes to develop an awareness of adult roles (work and family), (e) the support students and employees need to survive the hassles in non-traditional programs/jobs, and (f) what it means to be a woman and an administrator in vocational education. What is interesting is that two recurring sections of the magazine, Editorial Directions and Forum, did not address sex equity concerns, the topic of the issue (p. 8, 9, 13). This issue did include an article on the results and recommendations of the AIR Study and offered some practical suggestions for successful programming.

> ... in schools where efforts were underway to make students aware of non-traditional course options and to alert them to inequities in the job market, there were significantly greater numbers of non-traditional students (p. 39).

Staffing and enrollment patterns had changed little since 1972 with slight gains in some programs (ie., females in agriculture; males in home economics). Blatant discrimination, such as rules prohibiting enrollment in courses, per se, had disappeared. Yet, students were not receiving unbiased counseling, their attitudes were traditional and many faced discouragement when selecting non-traditional careers (p. 40).

Most of the activities undertaken by states were of a review, analysis and monitoring nature and only 30% were taking action to correct inequities (p. 40).

The study identified some programs which had been effective and found they shared some common elements:

1. Provide students with a thorough orientation to the program (both program content and job market realities).
2. Establish liaison with employers.
3. Use varied and innovative recruitment methods.
4. Provide support services as needed.
5. Employ staff who are committed to equity.
6. Expose employers and others to programs and provide support for non-traditional enrollees (p. 40-42).

VOC ED Journal, May, 1985
Issues Related to Carl D. Perkins Act

Special tribute was paid to Representative Carl D. Perkins in the May, 1985 issue of the VOC ED Journal. Perkins, a friend and supporter of vocational education throughout his many years in Congress, passed away on August 3, 1984 before the 1984 vocational legislation, which came to bear his name, was passed.

Charles W. Radcliffe, who served as Counsel to the Republican members of the House Committee on Education and Labor for 20 years said, "Carl Perkins won more legislative battles than most members of Congress will ever fight" (p. 27) and many were for vocational education. Perkins became chairman of the full House Education and Labor Committee in 1967 and remained in that position until his death.

The emphasis on sex equity in the 1976 Amendments, according to Radcliffe:

> ... came about because the single most dramatic change in the American labor market at that time was the massive entry of women on a full time basis (p. 28).

Radcliffe believed that changes in the membership of Congress, and Congressional awareness of massive changes in the workforce and a concern that not enough was being done to respond to these changes, were factors in AVA's decreasing influence over what would be included in the final bill (p. 27). The Senate version of the 1984 legislation, which leaned toward using federal funds for special population groups, dominated the final bill. This was a plus for sex equity.

In this same issue, Barbara Bitters, Vocational Equity Coordinator, and Mary Thompson, Acting Bureau Director for Program Support Services, both from the State of Wisconsin, wrote an overview of the sex equity provisions in the Carl Perkins Act (p. 38-39). They expressed the idea that the key to effective use of the sex equity funds was support from top level state and local administrators (p. 39). This fact was supported later by state coordinators across the country who responded to a questionnaire for this study.

What is the Role of Federal Assistance for Vocational Education? (19)
General Accounting Office Study (GAO)

In 1974, the GAO (Comptroller General of the United States), produced a study which included a review of vocational education programs and services in seven states: California, Kentucky, Minnesota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Texas and Washington. The report to Congress was titled, What is the Role of Federal Assistance for Vocational Education? It included recommendations regarding the elimination of sex bias and sex stereotyping in vocational education. Attention was focused on stereotyping in school catalogs which discourages women from selecting non-traditional careers. It was noted that the pronoun "he" was used in printed materials for nearly all subjects, except "she" was used exclusively when describing secretarial and nursing courses. Also, it was found that the physical plants in these states grouped traditional male and female programs in separate buildings.

Women in 1975 (18)
Report of the Citizens' Advisory Council on the Status of Women

The Citizens' Advisory Council on the Status of Women, in a report to the President in March, 1976, strongly supported changes in vocational education. The Council had held its own hearings on sex discrimination and stereotyping and learned that "... vocational education programs have grown an estimated 200% in the last decade, but that this growth has not been accompanied by expanded opportunities for women" (p. 15). Also, concern was expressed over the lack of enforcement by HEW of Title IX regulations. "Vocational education has remained an area of ingrained and traditional attitudes limiting the choices of young women" (p. 15).

> WHEREAS, Nationally, young women are overwhelmingly concentrated in vocational education programs which lead to low-paying occupations and careers.
>
> AND WHEREAS, In order to prepare young women adequately and equally for their increasing participation in the labor force.
>
> THE CITIZEN'S ADVISORY COUNCIL ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN, Reaffirms its recommendations made in the year 1972 and again recommends to the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare that immediate action be taken through administration and through legislation to correct inequities, so that all vocational education programs become actively open to the enrollment of all students, female and male (p. 15).

Working Toward Equity: A Report on Implementations of the Sex Equity Provisions of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act (64)

by NCWGE

The Coalition for Women and Girls in Education, the most influential group supporting sex equity legislation made major contributions by monitoring the implementation of various legislative initiatives. The Coalition's Task Force on Vocational Education had a long history of working toward improving the quality of vocational services for girls and women. In April, 1988 the Task Force completed a study, Working Toward Equity: A Report on Implementations of the Sex Equity Provisions of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act: NCWGE, which included sixteen states and focused on the key provisions of the law: (1) the single parent and homemaker program (8.5% set-aside) and (2) the sex equity program (3.5% set-aside). This monitoring project provided insight and raises questions regarding whether the original intent of Perkins was being accomplished.

The research revealed that states had been operating with vastly different interpretations of the law. This resulted in two major areas of concern: whether states are actually in compliance with the requirements of the law; and whether the original intent of the law is being met by the states (p. 2).

Information was collected from various sources including representatives from community colleges, secondary schools, community-based organizations, women's advocacy groups, sex equity coordinators and state officials. Since this is a recent report of major importance, the major concerns are summarized here (p. 5-19).

1. Administration

The Act specifically assigns the sex equity coordinator the responsibility for administering programs for single parents and homemakers and sex equity programs. It was "found that the coordinators' administrative responsibility is often limited, constrained or circumvented in a variety of ways. Lack of authority and decision-making involvement, restrictive guidelines, multiple administrations' separation of secondary and post secondary funds, problems with funds allocated on a formula basis, and "sign off" rather than administration of grants/contracts were cited as road blocks to administering funds.

2. Allocations of Funds

Congress had intended that funds be used to correct problems of under-service to certain segments of the population and for program improvement; however, old methods for allocating funds were still in use and the Act was being circumvented in various ways. For example, formula-allocated funds were too small to implement special programs for women and girls. Other observations were: too little attention was given to serving target populations, some organizations and institutions were excluded when computing formulas, and decisions regarding allocations excluded the sex equity coordinator and were made at various administrative levels.

3. Innovation Programming

It was noted that single parent, homemaker and sex equity set-asides had resulted in some new and innovative programs.

4. Coordination with Other Agencies

Progress had been made in the area of inter-agency coordination.

5. Non-traditional Training

A few states had encouraged women to enter non-traditional training programs.

6. Teen Parent Programs

Some success was reported.

7. Training/Technical Assistance

Assistance had been provided to educate service providers by offering staff training and developing curriculum materials.

8. Community-Based Organizations (CBOs)

The Act allowed and encouraged states to fund CBOs but in most instances the vocational system was closed to service providers outside the education system. Territorial issues rather than quality programs or costs maintained the status quo. Some subcontracting was taking place but was limited due to "red tape."

Schools did not receive sufficient funds to subcontract, CBOs did not receive enough money to provide quality programs, and many CBOs did not receive information regarding RFPs. The report stated that the multiple problems facing the target populations can only be addressed through coordinated efforts.

9. Support Services

The report indicated that it was difficult to assess how well states were meeting the need for support services which may be critical for women needing training. The law allowed but did not mandate support services. Child care and transportation were the most common services provided and even those received little attention.

Nine recommendations were presented for consideration for reauthorization of the Carl Perkins Act (p. 20-25).

1. Maintain the set-asides at the current level.
2. Require distribution of funds on an RFP basis.
3. Require that the Sex Equity Coordinators administer both set-asides and clarify the term "administer".
4. Add language to specify that pre-vocational services and comprehensive support services be made available as needed to potential and current participants. Also, include dependent care as an allowable support service under the 8.5% set-aside.

5. Require the U.S. Department of Education to conduct biennial oversight visits to states.
6. Require GAO to conduct a study to determine whether states are complying with the assurance that special consideration be given to displaced homemakers and those with the greatest financial need (single parent and homemaker funds).
7. Require SECs to collect data on those served by set-asides.
8. Strengthen language to ensure more involvement of community-based organizations.
9. Require that no part of financial aid received by students under the Act be considered as income or in determining eligibility for other federal financial aid.

APPENDIX S

RECENT PAPERS AND PUBLICATIONS IMPACTING THE REAUTHORIZATION OF THE CARL D. PERKINS ACT OF 1984

It is not the intent of this study to cover the reauthorization process for the Carl D. Perkins Act of 1984, which is due to expire on September 30, 1989. However, many of the studies and reports completed since 1985 by a variety of organizations and groups, contain recommendations for the reauthorization of the Act.

AAUW: Women and Vocational Education (1988)

During recent years, the American Association of University Women became a strong advocate for the sex equity provisions in the vocational education legislation. The Association presented a series of recommendations for improving the Act to the SECs at the AVA Annual Meeting in St. Louis in December, 1988.

Basically, AAUW called for continuation of the set-asides, clarification and consolidation of the SEC's authority, use of a discretionary funding process to distribute funds, greater participation by CBOs in programs funded by set-asides, provision of support services for prevocational and vocational students, assurance that women in these programs not lose subsistence benefits, and urging Congress to conduct regular oversight visits and collect appropriate data (2).

A "Fact Sheet on Women in Vocational Education" was distributed by AAUW at this meeting (1). It contains general information on women in vocational education and in the world of work and is included in the Appendix for reference purposes. The support of AAUW for sex equity issues in vocational education was significant and important because this group is seen as "educated and influential" in our society.

The 1989 Leadership Development Conference for sex equity coordinators, held in Washington, DC in late June, 1989 was offered concurrent with the Annual Meeting of AAUW. Joint planning and program sharing was undertaken so that both groups could benefit from all activities available. Sara Harder, President of AAUW during 1988-89, had a strong interest in vocational sex equity issues and was instrumental in stimulating support for improving women's opportunities through legislative initiatives.

AAUW was involved in the early hearings in Congress on Discrimination Against Women.

AVA's Issue Paper (January, 1989)

AVA's Issue Paper published in January, 1989 was written in two sections: (1) a summary of the AVA Board positions regarding reauthorization, and (2) proposed changes in the actual text of the bill (3). Under the heading of Sole State Agency and State Governance, special attention is given to the SEC's position. The AVA Board support the concept of a full-time coordinator position with sufficient staff, but added:

> ... as determined by the state director of vocational education, under whose supervision the coordinator would work in order to avoid administrative isolation. The bill also proposes that the current mandate for the coordinator to administer single parent and homemaker programs, as well as the sex equity program, be discretionary in order to maximize resources in the area of sex equity and expand administrative flexibility (p. 2).

The recommendation that a closer relationship between the sex equity coordinator and vocational education was an interesting one in light of current decision-making practices.

The AVA Board recommended changes in various portions of the law. Under the Statement of Purpose the word "women" is added twice to Purpose 2, and an additional Purpose (10), is proposed which would assure that persons dependent on ADC would have access to vocational training. Support was expressed for retaining the set-aside funds but a provision was included to allow for a transfer to up to 20% of the funds allocated to another category within the special population allotments (p. 16). Support, but flexibility -- an interesting concept!

NCWGE: Summary of Carl D. Perkins Act (May, 1989)

The NCWGE prepared a fact sheet with highlights of H.R. 7, The Perkins Act Reauthorization, now called the Applied Technology Education Amendments of 1989. Deborah Arrindell, Co-Chair of the Vocational Education Task Force for the NCWGE, and a staff member of WOW, prepared this summary.

Essentially, the main features of the bill are: set-aside funding would be dropped from 12 to 10 percent, the role of the SEC would be strengthened and defined, the word displaced would be added to the homemaker set-aside. Comprehensive support services provisions were enhanced, and data collection and oversight requirements were extended. A significant addition was the provision that assistance received under this Act will not be considered as income or resources in determining eligibility for assistance under other programs. (See Appendix for details.)

NASDVE: The Carl D. Perkins Act: A National Self-Assessment (May, 1989)

The National Association of State Directors of Vocational Education (NASDVE) undertook its own national assessment of the Carl D. Perkins Act (60). The focus was on the status of current implementation of the eight purposes of the Act. The study examined quantitative and qualitative data and a preliminary survey was initiated to determine data availability within the states. Data collection covered the transition years 1985-86, and two subsequent years, 1986-87 and 1987-88 (p. 1). The study was not designed to determine what was not happening. At least three sections of the study dealt with sex equity issues (p. 10-14).

Comments on programs and services for displaced homemakers and single parents, non-traditional women and sex equity were included along with specific examples from a variety of states (p. 10-14). Under the Commentary and Concerns Section (p. 16-17) continued support was expressed for both men and women entering non-traditional occupations in order to assist them in becoming aware of opportunities and to help them overcome barriers. It was indicated that major turnover in personnel in the field of vocational education means that gains will occur slowly and the effort to create change will remain constant. It was stated that many states had targeted the single parent, homemaker, teen parent and pregnant teen populations with considerable success (p. 17).

> Overall, it is encouraging to note that the special populations are benefiting from a comprehensive range of programs and services. As seen throughout this part of the study, when Congress appropriates set-aside funds, it has a major effect on state priorities. In every instance where new set-asides have been appropriated, programs, services and activities are in place to serve the populations specified. In summary, states have made strong efforts to meet the established priorities under this purpose of the Carl Perkins Act (p. 17).

Another purpose highlighted in the study was "to improve the effectiveness of consumer and homemaking education and to reduce the limiting effects of sex-role stereotyping on occupations, job skills, levels of competency, and careers" (p. 31). Interesting commentary on this purpose included the following:

> Some states have indicated that the sex role stereotyping statements contained in the consumer and homemaking section confuse the issues specified in the sex equity and non-traditional sections contained in Part IIA. However, the flexibility for the use of funds under this purpose of the Act has allowed states to provide services and activities to multiple audiences.
>
> The consumer and homemaking education issues of problem solving, human relations, nutrition and wellness, consumer economics, parenting and family, sex role stereotyping, and aging are top priority today and will be so in the future (p. 31-32).

NA: State Directors of Vocational Education: 1989 Statement to Congress (March, 1989)

The State Directors statement before the Education and Labor Committee of the House of Representatives on March 7, 1989 is contained in a seven page document and available from the National Association of State Directors of Vocational Education (61).

This is a general statement which reaffirms vocational education's role and contributions to the workforce, quality education for all, increasing access for individuals with special needs; and increasing efficiency, effectiveness, and coordination of social, economic and educational programs. One need of working or disadvantaged women was identified; to establish joint activities among human resources to address the issue of child care.

National Assessment of Vocational Education (1988-1989)

As they did in the Education Amendments of 1976, Congress mandated a national assessment of vocational education as a part of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act. The first interim report (National Assessment of Vocational Education, 1988a) indicated that a project on women and vocational education was underway in the area of access of special populations to vocational education.

The second interim report (National Assessment of Vocational Education, 1988b) noted that at least two-thirds of the states used only one method (among formula, competition and other discretionary means) to allocate funds for the single parent and the sex equity set-asides. Formula funding for single parent and sex equity programming was most common in the southeast at the secondary level. No western states used formula funding at the secondary level. At the postsecondary level, formula funding was used in all regions of the country, with the west being the highest at 27% for single parent programming and 21% for sex equity programming.

The final report of the National Assessment was presented in five volumes. Volume I (152) provided a summary of findings and recommendations (Wirt, Muraskin, Goodwin and Meyer, 1989). Volume II (53) (Muraskin, 1989) examined how the Perkins Act was implemented. Volume III on secondary vocational education was unavailable to the authors of this report.

Volume IV (31) analyzed postsecondary vocational education (Goodwin, 1989). Using on-hand national databases (High School and Beyond, National Longitudinal Survey of the Class of 1972, and National Postsecondary Student Aid Survey), it was reported that the access of special populations to postsecondary vocational education in general does not seem to be much of a problem, although black students remain under-represented at four-year and two-year public institutions. Minorities, women and economically disadvantaged students were reported to be disproportionately enrolled in vocational institutions that offer short-term training, primarily proprietary schools.

Volume V (39) described the participation of handicapped and disadvantaged students in vocational education (Hayward and Wirt, 1989). It was reported that women handicapped and disadvantaged students do not have equivalent access to specific labor market preparation or area vocational schools. Handicapped women students earn considerably fewer credits in occupationally specific courses than any other group of students. They lack access to business and office occupations and are disproportionately enrolled in training for service occupations and in consumer and home economics, in comparison to nonhandicapped women and men students.

Volume I included the findings and recommendations on single parent and sex equity programs that were provided in Volume II. Muraskin summarized the findings for the sex equity set-aside as pointing up the problems that occur when several conditions are present: federal resources are required to be additional, there is little local support for federal intent, and the grants are extremely small. The end product is likely to be a one-time, often peripheral activity. Furthermore, according to Muraskin, after observing these limited activities over time, practitioners may discount the importance of all sex equity efforts as well as the goal, as exemplified by the cynicism about efforts to achieve sex equity of some of the local administrators interviewed for the study.

Single parent and homemaker programs, according to Muraskin, appear to add to regular postsecondary institutional offerings and to rely on a variety of state and federal programs to support their costs. In several sites, school officials and program personnel indicated what, without the support package (of which Perkins Act funds are a part), these programs probably would not exist. The institutions view them as "add ons"; so although they are additional, they are also marginal and their survival depends on outside funding. Perkins Act funds may or may not be the impetus for their creation, depending on the site, but the funds support a piece of these additional programs.

Muraskin's (1989) recommendations for changes in federal policy, based on the national assessment, included:

- Establish minimum grants of sufficient size to purchase services.
- Increase the size of the sex equity grants.
- Include language in the legislation that makes it clear that the equal access provision applies to all vocational programs of local recipients whether the programs are federally funded or not.

This project was partially funded by Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act in cooperation with Delaware Department of Public Instruction and the University of Delaware.

The University of Delaware is committed to assuring equal opportunity to all persons and does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, sex, religion, ancestry, national origin, age, handicap or veteran status in its educational programs, activities, admissions or employment practices as required by Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and other applicable statutes. Inquiries concerning Title IX, Section 504 compliance and information regarding campus accessibility and Title VI should be referred to the Affirmative Action Office, 307 Hullihen Hall, (302) 451-2835.

> Although virtually every program that provides classroom training combined with on-the-job training has proven successful, virtually no state has given much state money to the issue.

• • • •

> Because of the vocational education legislation, we began to develop a variety of programs. While I don't think they worked as well as they could have, there is no question they made an impact. Yet we really were not as disciplined as we should have been in the systematic testing of programs, in looking at what worked, and in documenting the other things that you have to look at if it's [change] going to happen in vocational education. My great fear is that we're throwing out the baby with the bath water ... for the wrong reasons. Many people don't understand that the only way vocational education is going to survive is to integrate it with the academics. The great contribution of vocational education is its methodology. We use a lot of imaging, we use a lot of hands-on experiences, and we use a lot of logical problem-solving techniques. These are critical strategies to help students learn.
>
> The vocational and academic educators must find a way to come together. My fear is that there is not enough concern and that vocational education in the secondary school is losing. I think it's gaining in the community colleges, but not at the secondary level, and that's a great loss. Vocational education has a role to play in every curriculum -- that's the new vision for vocational education.

• • • •

The sentiment of the vocational education leadership probably was expressed by Radcliff when he stated:

> I firmly believe that the evidence weights heavily in favor of using most of the federal funds for much-needed program improvement, while retaining requirements to serve special needs populations. It seems to me that the interests of the handicapped and disadvantaged, and of others with special problems [emphasis by author] in being prepared for decent jobs, are best served by an overall vocational program characterized by excellence and accessibility (102, p. 29).

CHAPTER III

IMPLEMENTING THE LEGISLATION

> Equity is the fair and just treatment of all members of society who wish to participate in and enjoy the benefits of education and employment. The goal of vocational equity is to infuse equity in the fabric of the educational system to the degree that it's no longer an issue, it's a natural. [Sex Equity Coordinator]

Sex Equity Coordinators: Roles and Responsibilities

The effort to address the problem of overcoming sex discrimination, sex bias, and sex stereotyping in vocational education through legislation made it necessary to distinguish various terms that are used to depict particular aspects of the problem. These definitions appeared in the Final Regulations for Public Law 94-482 (Federal Register, Vol. 422, No. 191 - Monday, October 3, 1977, Section 104.73):

> Sex Bias: Behaviors resulting from the assumption that one sex is superior to the other.
> Sex Stereotyping: Attributing behaviors, abilities, interests, values and roles to a person or a group of persons on the basis of their sex.
> Sex Discrimination: Any action which limits or denies a person or a group of persons opportunities, privileges, roles or rewards on the basis of their sex.

PL 94-482 (Education Amendments of 1976) provided for a person to work full time to eliminate sex bias and discrimination in vocational education programs. The legislation did not provide a title for such persons, so that states could use appropriate titles within their state government systems. The position has, however, become identified as the "sex equity coordinator" position. (See Appendix for the various titles assigned to the position in the states.) The legislation provided that $50,000 of the Federal monies would be assigned to the sex equity coordinator position and that states would receive no Federal monies if the position was not established.

Ten functions to be carried out by the full time person were identified in the Final Regulation. They are as follows:

(a) Take action necessary to create awareness of programs and activities in vocational education designed to reduce sex bias and sex stereotyping in all vocational education programs, including assisting the State board in publicizing the public hearings on the State plan;

(b) Gather, analyze and disseminate data on the status of men and women students and employees in vocational education programs of the State;

(c) Develop and support actions to correct problems brought to the attention of this personnel, including creating awareness of the Title IX complaint process;

(d) Review the distribution of grants and contracts by the State board to assure that the interests and needs of women are addressed in all projects assisted under this Act;

(e) Review all vocational education programs (including work-study programs, cooperative vocational education programs, apprenticeship programs, and the placement of students who have successfully completed vocational education programs) in the State for sex bias;

(f) Monitor and implementation of laws prohibiting sex discrimination in all hiring, firing, and promotion procedures within the State relating to vocational education;

(g) Assist local education agencies and other interested parties in the State in improving vocational education opportunities for women;

(h) Make available to the State board, the State Advisory Council, the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education, the State Commission on the Status of Women, the Commissioner, and the general public, including individuals and organizations in the State concerned about sex bias in vocational education, information developed under this section;

(i) Review the self-evaluations required by Title IX; and

(j) Review and submit recommendations with respect to overcoming sex bias and sex stereotyping in vocational education programs for the five-year State plan and its annual program plan prior to their submission to the Commissioner for approval.

All states were required, by Federal regulation, to have adopted policies to assure equal access to vocational education programs by both men and women, including the actions to be taken to overcome sex discrimination and sex stereotyping in all State and local vocational education programs.

The Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984 (PL 98-524) maintained and strengthened the sex equity provisions of the previous Federal Vocational Education Act (Title II, Education Amendments of 1976, PL 94-482).

The Final Regulations of the Perkins Act list nine purposes of the Act. Three of the purposes are directly related to sex equity. They are as follows:

- Assure that individuals who are inadequately served under vocational education programs are assured access to quality vocational education programs, especially -- individuals who are disadvantaged, individuals who are handicapped, men and women who are entering non-traditional occupations, adults who are in need of training and retraining, individuals who are single parents or homemakers, individuals with limited English proficiency, and individuals who are incarcerated in correctional institutions.
- Assist the states to utilize a full range of supportive services, special programs, and guidance counseling and placement to achieve the basic purposes of the Act.
- Improve the effectiveness of consumer and homemaking education and to reduce the limiting effects of sex-role stereotyping on occupations, job skills, levels of competency and careers. (Federal Register, Vol. 50, No. 159, August 16, 1985 -- Final Regulations for the Perkins Act, Section 400.1)

As with the Education Amendments of 1976, a State that desires to participate in the Perkins Act State Vocational Education Program (that is, if the State chooses to receive Federal vocational education funding) shall assign one individual to work full time to assist the State board to fulfill the purposes of the Act by:

1) Administering the program of vocational education for single parents and homemakers and the sex equity program.

2) Gathering, analyzing and disseminating data on the:

    a) Adequacy and effectiveness of vocational education programs in the State in meeting the education and employment needs of women, including the preparation of women for employment in technical occupations, new and emerging occupational fields, and occupations regarded as non-traditional for women; and
    b) Status of men and women students and employees in the programs described in a).

3) a) Reviewing vocational educational programs, including career guidance and counseling, for sex stereotyping and sex bias, with particular attention to practices which tend to inhibit the entry of women in high technology occupations; and

b) Submitting recommendations for inclusion in the State plan for programs and policies to overcome sex bias and sex stereotyping in the programs in a).

4) Submitting to the State board an assessment of the State's progress in meeting the purposes of the Act with regard to overcoming sex discrimination and sex stereotyping.

5) Reviewing proposed actions on grants, contracts and the policies of the State board to ensure that the needs of women are addressed in the administration of the (Perkins) Act.

6) Developing recommendations for programs of information and outreach to women concerning vocational education and employment opportunities for women, including opportunities for careers as technicians and skilled workers in technical fields and new and emerging occupational fields.

7) Providing technical assistance and advice to local educational agencies, post-secondary institutions, and other interested parties in the State, on expanding vocational opportunities for women.

8) Assisting administrators, instructors, and counselors in implementing programs and activities to increase access for women, including displaced homemakers and single heads of households, to vocational education and to increase male and female students' enrollment in non-traditional programs. (Section 401.13)

A state is required to reserve at least $60,000 to carry out the provisions listed, including the provision to the full-time individual (the sex equity coordinator) of necessary and reasonable staff support. The use of the term "reserve" rather than the term "expend" at least $60,000 allows the states a period of up to 27 months to use the funds for sex equity, as is true for the use of other funds under the Perkins Act, as described in the supplementary information to the Final Regulations (p. 33231).

Appointments

Several states, notably Arizona, Illinois, and New York had placed people in positions resembling that of the sex equity coordinator prior to the required start-up date of the Education Amendments of 1976 (October 1, 1977). Other states were much more reluctant to establish the position, due to objections to the Federal law and/or the bureaucratic processes required to begin a new position. However, all of the states eventually did appoint someone to hold the position of sex equity coordinator. The names of all the persons who have held the sex equity coordinator position from the time of the establishment of the position can be found in the Appendix.

Vocational Education Equity Council (VEEC)

Development of the Organization

The Vocational Education Equity Council (VEEC) was organized on June 21, 1977 at the Hilton Inn in St. Louis, Missouri. Thirty-five people attended the organizational meeting. Over one-hundred Federal, state and local agency representatives as well as university and NCRVE representatives were in St. Louis to participate in "The National Invitational Workshop on Expanding Non-Traditional Opportunities in Vocational Education" being conducted by Ellis Associates with Mary Ellis as Project Director.

By-laws for VEEC were developed and a request to become a section of the New and Related Services Division of AVA was made at the 1977 AVA Convention in Atlantic City. This request was turned down. VEEC officers then approached the Administration Division of AVA for possible sectional membership. After rewriting the By-laws to conform to AVA rules and identifying 50 paid members of VEEC who were also paid members of the Administration Division, VEEC was accepted into the Administration Division at the AVA convention in Anaheim, California in 1979. Since that time, VEEC has been an active participant in AVA, providing programming at each annual convention and participating in the organizational work of AVA. A tenth anniversary celebration was a big part of the VEEC AVA program in 1987.

Leadership of the Council

VEEC members have provided leadership in various roles since it was organized. The following listing provides the names and states of the elected officers of VEEC from 1977 to the current date.

1977-1978
President: Fern Green, Oklahoma
Vice-President: John W. Havery, Oregon
Secretary-Treasurer: Linda Wilson, Oklahoma

1979
President: Linda Beene, Arkansas
Vice-President: Millie Huff, Tennessee
Secretary-Treasurer: Ella Stolz, South Dakota

1980
President: Linda Beene, Arkansas
Vice-President: Ella Stolz, South Dakota
Secretary-Treasurer: Nancy Evans, Ohio

1981
President: Ella Stolz, South Dakota
Vice-President: Nancy Evans, Ohio
Secretary-Treasurer: Cecil Wright, Texas

1982
President: Nancy Evans, Ohio
Vice-President: Beverly Postlewaite, Washington
Secretary-Treasurer: Joy Joseph, Louisiana

1983
President: Beverly Postlewaite, Washington
Vice-President: Loydia Webber, Georgia
Secretary-Treasurer: Ann Turnham Smith, Alabama

1984
President: Loydia Webber, Georgia
Vice-President: Marie Mayor, Maryland
Secretary-Treasurer: Mary Thompson, Wisconsin

1985
President: Marie Mayor, Maryland
Vice-President: Mary Ann Etu, New York
Secretary-Treasurer: Jane Adair, Illinois

1986
President: Mary Ann Etu, New York
Vice-President: Jane Adair, Illinois
Secretary-Treasurer: Elizabeth Stambolian, New Jersey

1987
President: Jane Adair, Illinois
Vice-President: Ann T. Smith, Alabama
Secretary-Treasurer: Elizabeth Stambolian, New Jersey

1988
President: Ann T. Smith, Alabama
Vice-President: Lou Ann Hargrave, Oklahoma
Secretary-Treasurer: Harriet Gleason, Washington

1989
President: Lou Ann Hargrave, Oklahoma
Vice-President: Harriet Gleason, Washington
Secretary-Treasurer: Georganna Hargadine, Missouri

1990
President: Harriet Gleason, Washington
Vice-President: Connie Gipson, California
Secretary-Treasurer: Georganna Hargadine, Missouri

Contributions and Accomplishments

VEEC has been active in AVA, providing programming on sex equity each year at the annual convention. In addition to substantive programming, the VEEC invitational social hours have become the place to be at the conventions. Honors and awards for contributions to sex equity have also had a place in the VEEC program at the AVA annual sessions.

VEEC has been continuously working on the challenge of regulations and legislation. When the proposed OCR Guidelines for Elimination of Discrimination and Denial of Services in Vocational Education were published December 19, 1978, Charlotte Carney Gore, Florida, chaired an ad hoc committee to prepare comments. On March 28, 1979, Linda Beene, Arkansas, presented testimony before the Senate Appropriations Committee regarding increased funding for programs to encourage non-traditional choices.

Many VEEC members were active in the reauthorization of the Federal vocational education legislation that culminated in the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984. VEEC leaders developed and presented testimony in the House and the Senate. Nancy Evans of Ohio, Connie Gipson of California, and Carol Jabonaski of New York presented testimony in House hearings of December 16-17, 1981. Michael Brustein of Washington, DC, Charlotte Gore, Carol Jabonaski and Marie Mayor of Maryland presented testimony to the House Subcommittee on November 9, 1983. The VEEC report on "Sex Equity in Vocational Education, 1981-1983: Summary of Activities by State", compiled by Beverly Postlewaite, Washington, was used as the basis for much of the testimony. Others who were very active in the reauthorization effort were Barbara Bitters, Wisconsin; Anna Biermeier, Wisconsin; and Barbara Hales, Utah.

VEEC members learned, very successfully, how to meet with, and influence national legislators. They learned the importance of networks and coalitions with other supporting groups. During the reauthorization process, VEEC members were active in providing data and information on successful state programs and recommendations for greater support. When the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act was passed in 1984, the sex equity provisions were strengthened.

VEEC has also met the challenge for leadership development. When, after the first national conference for sex equity coordinators, there was no Federal funding available, VEEC members organized the second conference themselves and have successfully held annual Spring Leadership Development Conferences every year since. All of the Federal sex equity specialists in the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) have been VEEC members: Sheryl Dembo, Barbara Bitters, Marie Mayor, Harriet Medaris, Joan Dalton, and Jane Adair.

VEEC continues to work on networking and support. The newsletter, begun as The Hotline in 1979 with Norma Milanovich, New Mexico, as the editor, became The Spotlight in 1984, with Mary Ann Etu, New York, editing. Other VEEC members who have edited the newsletter include Donna Boben, Minnesota; Lou Ann Hargrave, Oklahoma; and Mary Wiberg, Iowa.

Currently, VEEC is working on the reauthorization of the Perkins Act, with Connie Gipson heading up the effort. A position paper was published in March, 1989, calling for the retention of the vocational sex equity requirements and the set-aside provisions to remain unchanged. Both a Senate bill and a House bill have been passed that retain the sex equity functions. As of this writing, the joint Conference Committee to reconcile the two bills has not reached final agreement on the new vocational education legislation.

Ten Years in Retrospect

In preparation for the Tenth Anniversary Celebration of VEEC, the sex equity coordinators were asked to reflect on the past ten years and share their experiences, feelings and opinions. Some of their comments follow:

> It both saddens me and makes me extremely angry to see, in reality, how women are still often pigeonholed, held back, poverty-stricken and treated like second-class citizens. It also saddens me to see that men are not vigorously encouraged to pursue not only career goals but also family goals with equal interest and intensity.
>
> There are times when I rue the day I became involved with equity issues, but I would follow the same path if the opportunity were to present itself for the first time.
>
> No matter what region we represent, it is our common goal as sex equity coordinators to take positive steps toward a more ideal world, a world in which boys and girls are equally afforded the opportunity to become self-reliant and productive members of their communities.
>
> One of my greatest lessons in life, brought about as a result of my association with equity, has been in the area of the 'process of change'. ... the equity movement has provided me with an appreciable understanding of and sensitivity to the needs of significant population groups in our society.
>
> Fear always looms over the unknown, but once the new ground has been broken and the resources are available there always comes beautiful life.
>
> I also feel that being a coordinator took a lot of courage and some very tough skin. ... Perhaps the greatest lesson we have all learned is that social change takes a great deal of time. ... I left the coordinator position because I felt that I was no longer as effective as I wanted to be. Equity was referred to not as an equity issue but as 'that issue [NAME] was working on.'
>
> I found myself challenged in a way that I had not been challenged before in any other job ... Most people were not comfortable with the idea of supporting or promoting

a concept that they perceived to be in conflict with deeply ingrained values related to family and male/female roles in our society.

There is no one, easy solution. Only by trying to meet the needs of people will equity issues be resolved. A 1981 study by the National Institute of Education showed that in states where a clear commitment of time and resources and policy emerged, states made significant progress towards the achievement of sex equity.

In a recent profile in a local paper, I was characterized as 'The Relentless Reformer', who is working to achieve sex equity across the state. I believe that 'a house divided cannot stand', and until men and women learn to recognize one another as humans with unique interests and abilities, that are not gender related, we will continue to have conflict where cooperation and mutual respect should exist. I believe that every sex equity coordinator would agree that sex equity work is not for the shortwinded, but that each step forward is rewarding!

Despite our achievements, many barriers still exist, not only in the attitudes of persons who believe that women should not pursue trades, industrial and technology careers, but in the delivery system of vocational education itself.

The central issue has not changed in the nine years that I have been in the job. At the core of the problem is the poor self image women have of themselves and of their ability to cope with life as independent persons. Vocational equity programs have attempted to provide girls and women with choices and with the support systems necessary for them to exercise these new options. The choice may be a traditional job rather than a non-traditional job, but if the end result is personal and financial independence as well as the potential for upward mobility in the job market, the sex equity program has been successful. Both individuals and systems must continue to grow and change if equal opportunity is to become a reality for all girls and women.

I am continuously challenged by the demands of being a 'change agent', and thanks to the commitment of many outstanding equity practitioners, I am encouraged by the success we are having. We are all pioneers -- exploring new possibilities for the 21st Century.

We found that for many becoming 'equity sensitive' was a painful process of self-examination. How far we've come, yet, oh, how far we have to go! We will come to a time when women and men have equal opportunity to choose, enter and succeed in all occupations, and in those occupations women and men will work together as equal contributors to productivity.

> So while we have made strides in so many non-traditional areas, we have only scratched the surface in the policy making areas. Now the hard job begins because the novelty of us has dimmed.
>
> The first change, of course, was that of opportunity. Now the biggest change of all has occurred. The mind-set has changed; the dreams have expanded.
>
> The progress that was made during the last ten years has far exceeded my expectations. In many areas, we have gone from downright hostility, to acceptance, and finally to enthusiasm over the right of people to select occupations regardless of gender, handicap, or ethnicity. ... those states that empower all of their citizens to improve their own lifestyle, who are not afraid for citizens to make decisions about their lives and those of their children, who are able to share power, and who can get the best out of all of their citizens -- the migrant student who invents a new process in genetics -- the black student who becomes a successful entrepreneur -- will lead the nation in productivity.
>
> Through the combined efforts of many people, students will come to realize that they need to select a career based on their interests and abilities rather than their sex, that both boys and girls will work outside the home for a large portion of their lives and that a rewarding family life will require that the female and male move away from traditional roles to a more equitable relationship.
>
> I look back on nine years of work, and fortunately, see many innovative and important pieces in place that didn't previously exist. All of this keeps me going and allows me to know that the equity efforts in vocational education are extremely important, productive and successful.

National Survey of Current and Former State Sex Equity Coordinators

The sex equity coordinators (SEC's) in the states were more intimately involved in the implementation of the federal legislation than any other group; therefore, it was important to solicit their feedback for this study. A questionnaire was developed and sent to all current and former coordinators that could be located. (See the Appendix for a copy of the questionnaire.) The purpose of the questionnaire was twofold; (1) to gather demographic information on the coordinators, and (2) to solicit their opinions and reactions regarding the results and impact of the federal vocational education sex equity legislation.

One hundred and ten questionnaires were mailed to SEC's and 65, or 59% were returned. Forty-one states were represented which means some states were represented by two/three people. This is an important fact to remember when reading some of the statistical information on the following pages.

Personal History of Respondents

The data collected on the educational backgrounds of respondents indicated that they were prepared in a variety of disciplines. The majority (48 of 65) had enrolled in an academic program while in high school and only five had selected a vocational program. Seven were in a general program and three called their program a "combination".

There was great diversity in the degrees received at the Baccalaureate and Masters levels as can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1 - Degrees By Major

Baccalaureate N=65		Masters N=59	
Business	14	Guidance & Counseling	12
English	9	Education	7
Education	7	Business	7
Home Economics	6	Voc. Administration	5
Sociology	5	Ed. Administration	4
Elementary Education	5	Adult & Continuing Ed.	4
Psychology	4	Home Economics	3
History	3	Psychology/Human Develop.	3
Vocational Education	2	Social Work	3
Other	10	Other	8

Thirteen had obtained a doctorate and only two were in subject matter disciplines (Anthropology and English Literature). Seven majored in either educational or vocational education administration; two in community college education and two in curriculum. Four said they were currently enrolled in a doctoral program.

The average number of positions held by respondents throughout their career was 3.4, with a range of 2 to 9 positions in a variety of agencies. However, the majority of positions were in educational institutions (Table 2).

Table 2 - Positions Held (Frequency)

Educational Positions Held		Number Employed in Other Agencies	
Teacher/Professor	45	Social Services	10
Supervisor/Consultant	40	Business & Industry	6
Administrator (Other than SEC)	29	Self-Employed	4
Guidance Counselor	7	Medical Profession	2
		Private Practice	1
		Other (eg., Secretary, Legislative Aide, etc.)	8

The number of different individuals who had held the position of SEC in the states ranged from one to five. Three had been the one and only SEC in their state; 19 the second, 20 the third, and 15 the fourth. Five responses indicated five or more had been different coordinators since the position was established.

There was some hesitancy in responding to the question about "being able to fulfill their functions as required under the law". Comments such as "mostly", "sometimes", "it depends" were attached to the 38 positive responses. Their ability to do the job as mandated was affected by personnel changes and the degree of commitment to sex equity issues on the part of the higher administration. Sixteen indicated that they were not able to do the job and felt that the law was being circumvented by the state.

The specific responsibilities of the SEC were outlined in the legislation. Although most were administrative tasks, only 12 of the respondents indicated that they were classified as an administrator. The remainder were given a variety of titles; consultants (23), supervisor (9), supervisor/consultant (11), and ten listed a variety of other titles (eg., specialist).

Of the 65 persons who responded to the survey, 37 belonged to VEEC. Thirteen of the remaining 38 are no longer working in the area of equity and one said she plans to join the organization.

When asked if VEEC had contributed to their personal and professional development, 17 did not respond. Those that did, identified the following as important contributions: networking, support for each other, dissemination of information and resources, assistance in understanding and administering the legislation, and providing leadership development opportunities. Also, they felt that VEEC made an impact on the field of vocational education, lobbying for funds and providing visibility for equity issues.

Factors Contributing to the Passage of the Federal Legislation

1976 Amendments

Issues, concerns and events which contributed to the inclusion of the sex equity provisions in the 1976 amendments were identified by the 65 current and past sex equity coordinators. Six factors were cited as most significant:

1) Enrollment Data: Statistical data collected on a national basis showed the low enrollment of female students in non-traditional vocational programs. Segregated classes were the norm and females were being relegated to training for low-pay, low-status occupations.

2) The Women's Movement: As a result of the Women's Movement, attitudes changed and "it was acceptable" for women to effect change. Women learned to network and lobby. State and national women's groups created pressure for change.

3) Changing Family Structures: National statistics painted a startling picture about families, women and children in America (eg., divorce, single parent families, female heads of households, working women).

4) Women in Poverty: The relationships among job training, job opportunities, wage disparity and the change in family structures were highlighted as reasons for the "feminization of poverty," especially for minority women.

5) Legislative Activities: Passage of Title IX laid the groundwork by placing women's issues and sex discrimination before Congress and the public. Testimony provided by a wide variety of individuals and groups at Congressional hearings on sex discrimination and for the reauthorization of the Vocational Act of 1963 included the facts outlined in the four previous statements.

6) Economic Impact of Sex Discrimination: Congress pays more attention to issues which have a direct impact on the economy and the use of federal money to support people at-risk is expensive. It became apparent to Congress that continuing patterns of discrimination in all aspects of society affect the taxpayer's pocketbook.

Carl Perkins Act of 1984

Extensive effort and time went into the reauthorization of the '76 Amendments to the Vocational Education Act during the early 1980's. Factors which contributed to the continued inclusion of the sex equity provisions in the Carl Perkins Act, plus additional funding for single parent and homemaker programs, included those listed under the '76 Amendments. However, the group identified four additional factors which they felt were important in obtaining support for sex equity in the Carl Perkins Act.

1) Lack of change since the passage of the '76 Amendments: Congressional leaders were disturbed, and in some cases angry, with the limited progress achieved by the vocational community in addressing sex bias and sex stereotyping in vocational education. Therefore, Congress placed more pressure on the status to adhere to the law by strengthening the legislation and providing set-aside funding for at-risk populations.

2) Better documentation: More and better statistical data were available on vocational education enrollments. Also the 1980 census data provided detailed information about women, families and work. These data provided a gloomy picture of the status of women in this nation and was powerful support for the need to provide better vocational education opportunities for women.

3) Support of women's groups: The advocacy groups had learned from experience that they could make a difference especially when they worked together for a cause. They wanted to win and they did. People like winners; thus Congress took them seriously.

4) Lack of support services for at-risk groups: Attention was focused on the needs of children and families; not just women. As a nation, we were becoming more aware of such issues as the growing number of poor families and the impact this had on young children; and the relationship between welfare, working mothers and child care. We were developing a national conscience about matters which were basically women's issues but had never been perceived as such in the past. Fortunately, Congress was concerned and listened.

SEC's Involvement in Legislative Activities

It was difficult to gather meaningful information on the SEC's involvement in the development or implementation of the '76 Amendments because the position of SEC did not exist prior to the passage of the Amendments. Only ten of the respondents had been active at the national level in getting the '76 legislation passed. Activities undertaken by these SEC's included: writing letters and making telephone calls to Congressional representatives, providing input on position papers, presenting testimony at hearings and participating in professional meetings. In general, they played an advocacy role and promoted networking among interested groups.

About half (34) of the respondents had been responsible for the implementation of the '76 Amendments at the state level. This was not an easy task. The coordinators met resistance from within the state agency from both administrators and colleagues, as well as from the local level. The majority said their first step was to assist others in developing an awareness of the law and its provisions and requirements. This was accomplished by providing inservice workshops for a variety of groups, making presentations across the state, and developing materials and resources for use by local school personnel. In addition, policies and guidelines for implementing the law were developed and distributed to all agencies receiving federal vocational education funds.

At this point, coordinators spent most of their time "selling the concept" to a variety of constituencies with the hope that acceptance and action would follow.

> There was a tenseness about achieving those ten required tasks because nobody told us how. We had to do it all. Our meetings [of SECs] were extremely tense. We were worried about political survival in the departments as well as survival in Vocational Education. Discussions about those things were always foremost when we got together. One of the most obvious barriers was time and how in the world we could complete those ten tasks.

In addition some had to sell the concept to those who were close to them. For example,

> My father, who is now 96, thought that he had really lost me. He told me to get out of this stuff! My mother was kind of the same.

Twenty-two of the respondents had been involved at the national level with some aspect of the development of the Carl Perkins Act. Coordinators and others concerned about sex equity had gained experience in lobbying, networking, and politics and had become more deeply involved and more sophisticated in designing strategies for change. Although the methods used to focus attention on sex equity issues were similar to those used in earlier times, the efforts were more intensive and more effective than in the past.

State level activities changed from awareness to a technical assistance mode (although the former continued to be important). Sex equity coordinators placed emphasis on program planning, curriculum development and evaluation. The latter included both program evaluation and determining if recipients of funds were meeting the requirements of the law (monitoring). Publications and curriculum materials were prepared by state staffs and external groups under contract.

It is important to note that these coordinators were concerned about other federal sex equity legislation. Seventeen reported they had actively supported Title IX legislation, and 15 were involved in the support of the Equal Rights Amendment.

Nineteen of the respondents said their state had passed sex equity legislation; one additional state was in the process, and others indicated (23) that state policies had been developed in this area.

State Reactions to Provisions of Law

An attempt was made to discover how states reacted to the mandated position of sex equity coordinator and where the position was placed within the hierarchy of state government.

Twenty-three respondents reported there had been a change in the structure of the vocational education unit within state government and the placement of the SEC position since the position had been established originally. The majority of these changes placed the SEC at a greater distance from the state director. Also, only 13 of the SECs reported directly to the state director of vocational education. Twenty-seven were two levels below the director; 12 three levels and two each were four/five levels down from the top. Five were not housed within the state office.

> I was put under the direction of the associate superintendent of research so that he could use the equity secretary for some of his work. It was purely a case of having another source of money.

The coordinators believe that placement of the position is a critical factor in their ability to be effective as change agents. Power, status and support are based on where you are in the hierarchy, where you are housed and who you know. These factors impact on one's ability to function effectively within the unit and state.

The major reasons for changing the placement of the position were: (1) employment of a new state director of vocational education or chief state school officer, (2) restructuring of the unit or agency, (3) adding managerial levels, and (4) too many people reporting to the state director.

When asked if they believed it was necessary to mandate the position of SEC in order to ensure that the vocational education community addressed sex equity concerns, 59 responded with a resounding "Absolutely," "Definitely," "For Certain," (six did not respond). They felt that "nothing would have happened otherwise" because "ours is a conservative state," sex equity "was not a priority" and there was and is "little commitment" to the problem. Many said "it was difficult even with the law" and "there was more lip-service than action". Respondents stressed that there is still a lack of interest and support at all levels and a reluctance to accept change, especially at the local level.

This group reported that the leaders within the state were upset with the mandated provisions of the law. They did not want to be told what to do and they felt that money was being diverted from other vocational activities (primarily traditional ones). A sample of the comments made by respondents follows:

> There were no initiatives at the state level to involve females in the majority of vocational programs.
>
> Resistance among [state] staff is finally breaking down but it has taken a lot of time.
>
> Without the law and funds, concepts and ideas [related to sex equity] would never have been implemented.
>
> The state continues to drag its feet.

The legislation called attention to the problem and provided a solution.

No one wants the boat rocked.

However, the majority of respondents believe that progress has been achieved but "it takes constant attention". Vocational education is a male bastion and stereotypical, traditional attitudes and actions are hard to change.

Did the states react negatively or positively to the establishment of the SEC position and/or the person hired to fill the position? Twenty-five said there was a negative response to establishing the position, 15 were positive, two checked neutral and 13 said both negative and positive (10 had no knowledge). It was felt that the negative reactions were based on a lack of understanding of the role and responsibilities of the SECs and the basic political reaction that this was federal intervention in states' rights.

Some agency administrators were sure they would be sued; soon and often. Some were threatened because they might lose control, many believed it wasn't necessary to have such a position and one person said the position was seen as "a big joke". Local districts were strongly against the position and the changes which would be required. Those that supported the need for the position were primarily women outside the state agency. Numerous women's groups had worked hard to institute changes in vocational education. Also when the state director was supportive, the rest of the staff had a more positive attitude.

There is no doubt that the individual employed as SEC made the difference as far as acceptance was concerned -- "We had to fight the women's libber image". Twenty-four stated that there was a positive reaction to the individual who was first employed, 17 said the reaction was negative and six said both negative and positive (18 had no knowledge). Most indicated that they had to work hard to be accepted and life was far from easy. It took a rare person to survive those early days and many didn't.

Major Barriers Encountered

A great deal of credit must be given to the sex equity coordinators in each state who were responsible for implementing the provisions of the legislation both in 1976 and 1984. The word courageous is not too strong because it took strength, commitment and dedication to overcome the barriers faced by these individuals at the state and local level.

The resistance to the 1976 sex equity provisions of the law was strong at the state level and often hostile at the local level. Respondents stated that there was a lack of support from top level state and local administrators and attitudinal bias was obvious. In addition to the lack of commitment, there was a sense of complacency about the issue throughout the vocational community.

> I thought, 'this is an almost impossible job,' but I chipped away at it. I've always believed that you don't try to eat the whole elephant at once, you look at some of the areas you might change. With hindsight, one of the positive things I did was to get a male on board to help me; not in my office, but through a contract to develop materials and be out there in the field with me.

> In my state, the males in the state agency would laugh and they would make sexist jokes just to see my reaction. They would put pictures of cheerleaders in skimpy outfits on the bulletin board and make comments.

The 1976 Amendments provided federal funds to support the position of SEC and there was little money available for programs and services. Therefore, the coordinators had no clout and were given little authority or freedom to make changes.

> I had two advocates, the Title IX Coordinator and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. The Title IX people were real supportive and that group had access to the Superintendent. My external support came from community workers and community volunteers. I had friends who were involved in networks and some school districts wanted to participate. The State Commission on the Status of Women was really the only state advocacy group that would write letters and tell the Superintendent what we ought to be doing.

> I think there's been a lack of real commitment from the top down to the local level. I've always said the issue is people and if the teacher is committed, things will happen in the classroom; if the counselor is committed, things will happen with the kids they counsel; if a school principal is committed, that school will be a different school; if the superintendent is really committed, and so on.

With the passage of the Carl Perkins Act, barriers listed previously were still there, especially the lack of authority and inability to act in a decision-making capacity. Many state leaders were still fearful or unwilling to share the administration of federal funds, which is a serious problem even today. Also, the mechanism for distributing federal funds (ie., formula allocation) selected in some states, created problems because it is not an appropriate way to fund new programs and projects which impact on specific populations.

Coordinators faced several different barriers in implementing the Carl Perkins Act; for example, convincing girls and women that many opportunities and choices are available to them other than the traditional female occupations. It was difficult for a SEC to reach students and women in the community and it took a long time to re-educate school and community personnel who were assisting females in making career choices. Also, local agencies were slow in applying for federal funds to develop creative approaches to the elimination of sex discrimination. The "slowness of change" and "indifference" were terms most often used to express the frustration of the sex equity coordinators. The attitude of administrators, who were primarily males, was the major barrier to effective implementation of the sex equity provisions of the Act.

> I hadn't been on the job more than a week or so when they told me I had to write an RFP for a sex equity grant. The next three years in particular ... were excruciatingly painful because it didn't take me very long to realize that I was not the person they were looking for. They were looking for someone who would give them the credentials, but give up her soul and her commitment to equity, and buy into a sexist and racist administration. It was painful. No one in the department knew what I was supposed to be doing. (When I joined the staff, our division was 69 percent white male; in 1988, our division staff, not including secretaries, was 69 percent minorities and females). They might have thought they could manage me when they picked me. I think they've been surprised.

States' Concern for Sex Equity Issues

There is no doubt that the majority of this group (55) felt that their state would not have addressed sex equity issues in vocational education without the force of law. Some of their responses say it best. "Bias is deep and the notion of equity is threatening." Much of the blame was placed on the male, very sexist, traditional attitudes of the "good ole boys network." The states had many other priorities and money was a problem. The leadership wanted federal funds to maintain on-going programs and services. It was surprising how many respondents said, "Ours is a conservative state" and that "women's issues and feminism is seen as a fad" or seen "as an impediment to real programs" in vocational education. "The dollars were needed to make it happen" and few states provided additional state dollars to support sex equity activities.

Two individuals did not respond to this question and eight felt that sooner or later their state would have become involved but "slowly" and "not on as large a scale." One person said, "we had a progressive state director of vocational education which made the difference." Also, "Civil Rights legislation had begun to have an impact." However, it should be noted that it took the force of law to make changes in this area also.

Another critical issue for all vocational educators is beginning to surface and was expressed by a SEC:

> Vocational education in this state is being downgraded. We used to have a Division, and we used to have some kind of clout. In fact, we used to keep the Board of Education busy with our stuff, now we are at the very bottom of their agenda.

> When they passed the new minimum standards for high school graduation, it was almost designed (I sound paranoid) to wipe us out.

SEC's Expectations for Change

Subjects were asked about their expectations for change with the passage of the 1976 Amendments. Many were not involved during that time, but those that were and responded (about 50%) expected changes to occur faster than they did. They expected greater support from "the powers that be" who believed local agencies would make a real effort to provide opportunities for women in non-traditional programs, and that there would be significant enrollment shifts. They were surprised at the slowness of attitudinal and behavioral changes at all levels.

Some were naive and some were hopeful that this was the beginning of real change in vocational education. As one person said, "I believed that awareness would lead to action." Several believed that doors would be opened so that women would become part of all levels of the work force and all occupational areas.

The less optimistic members of the group felt that change would be slow and one person said, "I really didn't see much hope." However, most were encouraged and believed that the force of law would lessen sex role stereotyping and sex bias as school personnel became more aware of the barriers and harmful effects of discrimination against girls and women in vocational education.

Were the respondents' expectations realized? The most common answer was, "To some extent." There is no doubt that the coordinators were frustrated by the slow progress and difficulty in changing traditional attitudes, especially at the secondary level. Most felt that things had improved and more female students were being served. Also, states had become better organized and more effective in designing strategies for implementing the provisions of the law. The greatest strides seemed to be made in the area of awareness rather than action. Yet, there were examples of progress. One person said, "The impact was phenomenal!" Another state provided a considerable amount of state monies to develop pilot programs, while another placed the coordinator in a top-level managerial slot with excellent support services.

> In my state, the major accomplishment was to bring the professionals of the staff together on the issue. We had a lot of men on the staff who were simply not about to be brought into the movement, but eventually they ended up being very strong promoters of the equity issue as well as good deliverers on related tasks.

Time and experience with the legislation shaped the respondents' expectations regarding the impact of the Carl Perkins Act. They felt that the provision of funds for single parent and homemaker programs would provide more options for at-risk populations. Also, these programs could be offered through a variety of agencies other than public schools. They hoped to see more women in leadership positions in vocational education and more women becoming economically independent. They looked forward to clear policies regarding sex discrimination, a climate in which mandates of the law would be accepted and more activities which would reduce long-entrenched discriminatory patterns. In essence, an acceleration of the change process.

Once again, respondents reported that progress was slow. In the beginning, state leaders were extremely negative about set-aside funding for single parent and homemaker programs and the fact that Congress had "slapped their hands" and told them to "get on with it." Time helped and the sex equity coordinators proved to be effective leaders and implementers. Enrollments began to change, especially at the post secondary level.

> We had a greater impact and made significant inroads for adult women because of the change in the structure of the law and the emphasis on single parents and homemakers. Now we're basically in the business of working with adult women and/or teen parents (which may influence what happens in schools).

There was greater cooperation between state and local personnel as local teachers were able to apply for grants to develop their own ideas. Problem areas that still exist are: few males are enrolling in traditional female occupations, on-going support services for females in non-traditional programs are limited, guidance counseling is too traditional, and too many people think that sex equity issues have been resolved.

Considerable progress has been made in the integration of males and females in vocational youth organizations at all levels. Both males and females are serving in leadership positions within the state and national organizations. "We have a long way to go" was the most common response in this area. One coordinator said, she had been demoted from an administrator to a consultant and had no support staff or adequate office space yet. The move from awareness to action seems to be under way, but "will not continue without the requirements and financial support of federal legislation."

Most Significant Outcomes

There was complete agreement that the most significant outcome of the '76 Amendments was the required position in each state for a sex equity coordinator and provision of funds to support the position. This put the federal government on record as recognizing the need to address and resolve equity issues and required states to do the same. The '76 Amendments created the awareness needed to stimulate change in vocational education activities and services.

This was landmark legislation. Title IX prohibited discrimination on the basis of sex; the '76 Amendments said action must be taken to eliminate sex bias and sex stereotyping in vocational education. As many respondents said, "This legislation got the professionals' attention" and "those denied access to vocational education programs must be given an opportunity to enroll."

One person felt "that the sex equity provisions were too altruistic for effective implementation." This statement exemplifies that even a sex equity coordinator had difficulty accepting the fact that equal access is a basic right of all individuals.

It is apparent that Congress was committed to sex equity because they retained the sex equity coordinator position in the Carl Perkins Act. Respondents said that this fact and the provision of set-asides for single parent and homemaker programs were the most significant aspects of the new law. Of great importance was the targeting of at-risk populations for special consideration. In previous vocational education legislation, Congress set aside funds for disadvantaged and handicapped populations and once again they believed that this was the way to go if sex discrimination was to be eliminated. State and local educational agencies were put on alert -- the "feds" meant business, and not as usual! One respondent described Congress's message to the states, "Ya really oughta, wanna help women." Another person stated, "I hope to be able to answer the question [most significant outcome] in twenty years."

There was no doubt that providing funds for projects made it possible to reach a wider variety of clients, especially adult women, by providing the support services (ie., child care, transportation) they needed to participate in job training programs. However, the federal funds did not go far and most states did not provide additional state monies for these activities. Another significant outcome of the legislation identified by the respondents was developing an awareness of the issues on the part of Congress, educators and the public. Sex bias and sex stereotyping had been such a normal way of life that many had no understanding of how it affected the individual lives of girls and women, or how it impacted on families and society in general. The legislation promoted the philosophy that sex discrimination in vocational education is a serious problem which permeates all aspects of the vocational system.

As a result of both the '76 Amendments and the Carl Perkins Act, progress has been made. Enrollment of females in non-traditional training programs has increased as opportunities have expanded.

> I think we've opened the doors for teenagers who wanted to be in something non-traditional, but there are very few of them. Frankly, changes in enrollment at the high school level have not been that great. I would like to think that because of what we did, that is not staying in 'our own little vocational area', we had some impact on what happened to girls

> in the academic areas as well. I think the presence of the issue probably had an effect beyond vocational education. In other words, even though the enrollment patterns did not go up considerably, there were some attitude changes.

Sex equity is becoming institutionalized at the various educational levels and community-based organizations are becoming more involved with the preparation of women for work. Counseling, recruitment and placement of males and females in programs of their choice is becoming more acceptable. Some of the barriers have been eliminated as more educators realize "this issue is not going away" and that "evaluative procedures require attention to the issue."

Women are beginning to move into leadership positions but there are still very few at the highest levels of management. Great strides have been made in improving and expanding opportunities for adult women. Federal funding for single parent and displaced homemaker programs made a difference. However, this group feels that the least amount of progress has been made at the secondary (local) level and within state leadership.

Techniques and Strategies Used to Implement Legislation

The respondents were asked to share any techniques or strategies they used that were successful in implementing the legislation. Workshops and other types of inservice programs were the most popular. Coordinators met with and trained numerous groups of educators as well as members of community agencies and professional organizations. "Getting out the work," "making them aware," "providing technical assistance" and "developing advocates," were the objectives of these initiatives. As one person said, "A strong network of administrators (male/female) who take the situation seriously, who support the issue and will help solve problems, is your best approach."

The success of model programs was an effective way to encourage involvement. Using these as demonstration programs and giving them publicity was a successful technique. Involving local educators in identifying needs and working with them in a helpful, sympathetic manner were seen as critical steps in creating successful programs.

The lack of staff at the state level was a real problem in promoting change. Most states had one individual to cover the entire state and in many cases there was little support assistance (ie., secretarial). A few states designated local or regional supervisors of sex equity to assist the state coordinator in developing new programs.

Policies and requirement outlines in the state plan, in evaluation procedures and in the application process forced local districts to comply with the Act. If they wanted money, they addressed sex equity concerns! Advisory groups were successful in securing local support and serving as advocates for equity. Small grants to initiate a unique idea, job fairs promoting equity, using women employed in non-traditional occupations as role models for students, providing student leadership workshops, working with local women's groups and political parties, distributing pertinent information via media and newsletters, providing technical assistance, and offering inservice training to state staff were strategies used to implement the legislation. The amount of time and energy expended on these activities was extensive and most activities had to be accomplished by the individual coordinator. Fortunately, the Carl Perkins Act provided funds for contracted services which allowed the coordinator more time for developmental activities.

Many innovative programs and services developed as a result of the legislation have been used as models across the country. Yet, more needs to be done.

> We need to disseminate our legislative results to national centers in all regions of the country that cover this topic. I do not see adequate dissemination to the College Board or the Education Commission of the States. I would hope that before the sunset of the '84 Act, these groups will be drawn into the network of organizations committed to sex equity.

In the early days, the efforts and commitment of a few individuals and states were instrumental in stimulating others to try new ideas and realize that they could make a difference (see Appendix for examples). Also, credit was given to federal leadership efforts.

> I think the U.S. Office should be thanked for doing so much at the beginning in training and educating the coordinators about their jobs. Without that strong starting point, the SECs could not have followed through.

The Future of Sex Equity in Vocational Education

The questions were: What do you predict will happen in the future regarding sex equity issues and concerns in vocational education? and Will we see progress or setbacks? "I anticipate progress but not without federal support," "without [federal support] we will not only see setbacks but complete annihilation [of sex equity] if the money and position are compromised in any way." This expresses the attitude of most of the people who responded to the survey They said it depends on "the legislation," "the reauthorization process," "Congress" and "if it's an administrative [Executive Branch of government] priority." This group believes that progress in sex equity will be achieved only if the legislation stays as it is or is strengthened and if the position of sex equity coordinator is retained.

Many feel there has been a conservative trend in the country which has led to apathy or a belief that the issue is resolved. "We must keep the issue alive," "continue to push for change," "institutionalize the concept of equity for all, not just females," "help men see the benefits of equity for themselves," "make it a political issue."

> It's an exciting time and an exciting job! It's a 24-hour-a-day job. There's a lot of thanks due to a lot of people in all the states that helped and were there when I needed them. We are a very tight knit group [SECs]. It's interesting how people phone if they've had a bad day ... I think the support network and caring of all the coordinators for each other has been a real strong force in keeping us up and keeping us going.

The economics aspects of the issue do make it a political concern. There are more women in the work force than ever before and there is a growing need for a skilled labor force. These needs, plus the feminization of poverty and the lack of quality child care all impact on the economy. Therefore, respondents feel that sex equity cannot and will not be overlooked in the years ahead. Yet their statements are tempered with only if's; "progress will be achieved only if there is Federal support in the form of legislation and money."

Contributions by The National Center for Research in Vocational Education
The Ohio State University

The Research Center was established at Ohio State in March, 1965, as the Center for Research and Leadership Development in Vocational and Technical Education. The Center's involvement in research and development focusing on sex equity began in 1966, long before the passage of Title IX and the Education Amendments of 1976.

Following is an overview of major publications produced at the Center and projects and activities undertaken to address sex equity issues. Authors and publication dates of documents are included for easy reference. All are included in the Bibliography.

The first project was a national conference on the educational implications of women's work patterns conducted with representatives of all the service areas in vocational education, with the exception of agriculture. (Agriculture representatives were invited to attend, but declined. This is somewhat ironic in light of the good progress agriculture has made in enrolling women students and educating women teachers.) Future research possibilities were established and an annotated bibliography was prepared (Lee, Vetter, Howell, and Smith, 1967a and b). Louise Vetter, consultant for this study on legislation, helped prepare that bibliography when she was a graduate research assistant for the conference project. She continue to work for the Center until her retirement in 1988.

The second project at the Center was a research study on the occupational knowledge, attitudes, and plans of high school senior girls. Seniors in six schools in three states (Ohio, Kentucky and Michigan) participated in the study (Lee, Ray, Vetter, Murphy, and Sethney, 1971). Murphy and Vetter, authors of this document, were both involved in the above named study when they were graduate research associates working toward their doctorates at The Ohio State University. Murphy returned to the New Hampshire State Department of Education where she was employed for fifteen years in a variety of leadership roles in the Division of Vocational Education; Consultant for Home Economics Education, Director of Secondary Vocational Education, Director of the Research Coordinating Unit, Deputy Chief of Vocational Education and Acting Chief (State Director) of Vocational Education. She was one of a few women to head a state vocational division prior to the '76 Act.

The results of the research study from the second project were used to develop curriculum materials, *Planning Ahead for the World of Work*, that were field tested at the seventh, ninth, and eleventh grade levels (Vetter and Sethney, 1971; Vetter and Sethney, 1972). A follow-up study was conducted a year later to evaluate the effects of participation in the curriculum (Vetter, Brown, and Sethney, 1975). The curriculum unit was among the first available in the area of career planning for women. The sponsor for the three projects was the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education (BOAE), Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Funding from the National Institute of Education (NIE) was utilized to assess career materials and their implications for women's career development (Vetter, Stockburger and Brose, 1974). A research study, *Career Patterns of a National Sample of Women* (Vetter and Stockburger, 1974), described the relationships between women's career patterns and variables such as education, attitudes toward work, and number of children. A parent handbook on the career implications of sex stereotyping, *Sugar and Spice Is Not the Answer* (Vetter, Lowry and Burkhardt, 1977) provided information and a question and answer format for use by parents to assist their children in making career decisions.

A set of presentations made at the 10th anniversary celebration of the Center (then called the Center for Vocational Education) was published as *Career Development of Women*: *Proceedings of 10th Anniversary Program* (Gorman and Vetter, 1975).

Resources on Sex-Role Stereotyping in Vocational Education, published in 1977 (Justice, 1977) included annotations on available reports, projects, materials, and resource personnel to assist the field in overcoming sex bias and sex stereotyping This publication was updated and made available as *Resource Update*: *1979 Sex Equity in Vocational Education* (Justice, 1979). A Resource and Referral Service (RRS) publication provided resources for sex fair curriculum development, K-12.

Research on career planning programs for women employees (sponsored by BOAE as a Part C project) led to four publications: *A Review of the Literature* (Winkfield, Lowry and Vetter, 1977b), *A National Survey* (Vetter, Winkfield, Lowry and Ransom, 1977), *An Annotated Bibliography of Programs* (Winkfield, Lowry and Vetter, 1977a), and *A Presentation of Prototype Programs* (Vetter, Winkfield, Ransom and Lowry, 1977).

During 1977-78, two training packages, sponsored by NIE, were developed to assist the new state vocational education sex equity personnel with raising awareness of problems, dealing with the mandated functions of the job, and in locating appropriate resources. The packages were used in five regional workshops (Boston, Nashville, Milwaukee, Denver, San Francisco), facilitated by Shirley McCune and project staff, for the state personnel. Multiple copies of the package, A Guide for Vocational Education Sex Equity Personnel (Vetter, Burkhardt and Sechler, 1978a) and Vocational Education Sex Equity Strategies (Vetter, Burkhardt and Sechler, 1978b) were distributed to the state sex equity coordinators. The Strategies training package was updated and republished in 1980, due to field demand.

The Center's project on occupational adaptability and transferable skills, sponsored by NIE, addressed the issue of sex fairness and held a June, 1979 symposium to focus on existing and potential solutions to problems encountered by women in career transition (Laitman-Ashley, 1979).

During the eleven years the Center held the National Center for Research in Vocational Education contract or grant (from January 1978 through December, 1988), 40 publications related to sex equity in education were provided to the field. The publications resulted from research, development and training efforts and included position papers, research reports, review and synthesis papers, annotated bibliographies and training packages. Topics included:

- alternative futures (Vetter, Spain and Kelly, 1981) (Vetter, Winkfield, Spain and Kelly, 1982)
- career choices (Berryman, 1988)
- communication skills (Sechler, 1981)
- day care (Hill and Bragg, 1985)
- entrepreneurship (Eliason, 1981; Taylor, 1986)
- guidance and counseling programs and services (Farmer, 1978; Harmon, 1979; Laitman-Ashley, 1979)
- job placement (Sechler, 1981)
- legislation and federal guidelines (Harlan, 1981; Vetter, Burkhardt, and Sechler, 1978a; Vetter and Richey, 1985)
- non-traditional vocational education enrollments (Vetter, Sechler, Lowry and Canora, 1979)
- parent awareness of non-traditional options and labor market trends (Canora, 1982)

- perspectives on equity (Evans, 1982)
- professional and managerial careers (Loring, 1979)
- professional development (Steiger and Schlesinger, 1979; Verheyden-Hilliard, 1979)
- recruitment of students for non-traditional vocational education programs (Spain, 1982; Vetter, 1988)
- resources (Justice, 1979; National Center for Research in Vocational Education, 1979; Vetter, Burkhardt and Sechler, 1978b)
- rural women (Dunne, 1985)
- sex-fair materials (Women on Words and Images, 1978)
- single parents and homemakers (Vetter, 1988)
- teacher preparation (Kane, 1978; Lowry, Mullen, Hooker, and Vetter, 1982)
- women in the skilled trades (Briggs, 1978)
- women in vocational education administration (Bowers and Hummel, 1979; Bowers, Quinn, and Hungerford, 1979; Ross, 1980)

In 1985, the guide for vocational education sex equity personnel was updated, based on the Final Regulations for the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act (P.L. 98-524) and the input of the sex equity coordinators who participated in a national conference at the Center in September (Vetter and Richey, 1985).

Many of the sex equity coordinators assisted the work of the Center through participation in conferences, providing guidance through project advisory committees, providing pilot test sites for materials development and reviewing draft reports. The following persons participated as members of advisory committees, provided pilot test sites or reviewed reports:

Deborah Dillon, Arizona
Connie Gipson, California
Patricia Goggins, Colorado
Barbara White, Hawaii
Connie Cline, Illinois
Hazel Davis, Kentucky
Joy Joseph, Louisiana
Edward Maroon, Maine
Marie Mayor, Maryland
Georganna Beachboard, Missouri
Sara Moore, Montana
Gary Waters, Nevada
Mary Ann Etu, New York
Carol Jabonaski, New York
Gary Ridout, North Carolina
Nancy Evans, Ohio
Fern Green, Oklahoma
Ann Winstead, South Carolina
Millie Huff, Tennessee
Barbara Hales, Utah
Noreen O'Connor, Vermont
Beverly Postlewaite, Washington
Mary Thompson, Wisconsin

Issues Needing Continued Attention

Participants identified the following issues and problems which will continue to need attention by all levels of education and government.

- Outdated reporting and data collection practices.
- Lack of women on boards and commissions.
- Lack of management training and technical assistance for current and potential women leaders.
- Inequities in wages and lack of equal pay for comparable work.
- Unequal benefits and pensions.
- Lack of housing options for women with children.
- Limited financing for women who do not have assets.
- Abuse; spouse, child and elder abuse; both physical and sexual.
- Sexual harassment in the workplace.
- Unique problems of female offenders.
- Special health problems of women; particularly minority women.
- Lack of multicultural and multilingual education (especially sexism in many cultures).
- Access to education programs and counseling on the importance of education.
- Lack of support for women entrepreneurs.
- Lack of affordable child care - commitment from federal, state and local levels of government and from business and industry is needed.
- Consideration of the longevity of women - must build structures to compensate for this fact.

CHAPTER IV

MAJOR CONTRIBUTORS TO THE LEGISLATION

> I believe that sex fairness is a fundamental human right. I certainly believe that the struggle for an end to occupational segregation by sex is part of the fulfillment of our American tradition. (Corinne Rieder, 1977)

It was impossible to obtain responses from all of the key people who were instrumental in the development, passage and implementation of the federal legislation. Many individuals are mentioned throughout the document. Following is a personal look at some of the people who contributed to the study and played a significant role along the way. Comments are from correspondence, telephone conversations and audio-taped interviews.

Margaret Dunkle, currently Executive Director of the Equality Center in Washington, DC, was one of the women who championed early efforts to eliminate sex discrimination in vocational education.

> My major involvement in the vocational education provisions was in the original passage of the amendments thirteen years ago. I chaired the National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education, which was the quite effective vehicle for pressing for the sex equity provisions. I also chaired the Coalition during the early days of implementation of the Title IX regulation and was heavily involved in making sure that the Congress did not disapprove the regulation after it was issued in 1975.

• • • •

A close colleague of Dunkle's was Cynthia Brown, now head of the Center on Educational Equity with the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO).

> In 1976, I worked for the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights. I was Co-Director with Norman Chachkin of the Federal Education Project that had started in 1975. Actually it [the project] started at the Lawyers Committee with two main programmatic emphases. The larger of the two was concerned with Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Educational Act, which provided federal assistance to schools with large concentrations of low-income children who were educationally disadvantaged. We also undertook a project on Sex Equity in Vocational Education that was funded by the

> Ford Foundation. Terry Sarrio at the Ford Foundation was our project officer. She came to the Lawyers Committee and asked us to take on this project. The foundation was very concerned about women in non-traditional courses and problems of women in the workforce (ie., their low pay and low skills).
>
> Around that time, ... Norman Chachkin, a long-time Civil Rights lawyer, who had been working on school desegregation issues, came to the Lawyers Committee from the NAACP Legal Defense Fund, where I had been for five years. Four years prior to that, I had been in the Office for Civil Rights working on school desegregation. At the Children's Defense Fund, I worked on school desegregation issues and education issues of low-income children and minorities. So when I went to the Lawyers Committee that was the first time I got professionally involved with questions of sex equity. I joined the National Coalition of Women and Girls in Education and took responsibility for a lot of work that the Coalition did in vocational education. Eventually, I went to the Office for Civil Rights in the Carter Administration and became Principal Deputy Director. Then I became Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights in the Department of Education. When I was in the OCR in the 60's, Title IX hadn't even been passed. When I was there during the Carter Administration, I was very active in Title IX enforcement issues and involved in lots of different sex equity/civil rights issues.
>
> I came here [to DC] because I have a deep commitment to public service, I mean my whole professional career had been involved with pursuing educational equity.

• • • •

Perhaps no one was more instrumental in helping to secure implementation of the '76 Amendments than Janet Wells.

> I had worked very closely with Cindy Brown, who for many years had worked with the Washington Research Project, and had just started a project for the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights. When she heard I was moving to DC, she asked me if I would like a job on their vocational project.
>
> They had gotten money from the Ford Foundation to work on sex equity in vocational education. I don't think that's something they had started out to do. Cindy had a lot of background in working on Title I, education of the disadvantaged. As I remember, Ford approached Cindy and asked her if she would be interested in the vocational education project and of course she was.

I arrived in DC in November of '76. That was election week. When Carter was elected, Cindy seemed to be a natural to work in the Office for Civil Rights. She, in fact, was made Deputy Director of the Office. Norman Chachkin who was Co-Director of the Federal Education Project also went to work in the Office for Civil Rights. I ended up doing much of the work in the vocational education area over the next seven years.

At the time I came, the law had just been passed [Vocational Amendments of 1976]. The Office of Education had just issued, or was about to issue, a Notice of Intent to Publish Regulations. They were soliciting input from the women's groups on what they wanted to see. It was a great time to be involved.

• • • •

Joy Simonson was the first Executive Director of the National Advisory Council for Women's Educational Programs (NACWEP) established by the Women's Educational Equity Act (WEEA). She served from 1972-1982. Prior to that time, she had done a considerable amount of speaking on women's issues but had not been involved specifically with vocational education.

I was involved very actively in the development and then passage of WEEA. I was one of the small group of six or seven women who met for a number of months to develop a proposed WEEA and then to work with the representative from Hawaii, Patsy Mink, who introduced and sponsored the bill in the House. In the Senate, we worked through Senator Mondale. WEEA passed the Senate and the House simply accepted the legislation so we didn't need a full vote in the House on WEEA. Also, I became involved somewhat with the groups that were working for enactment of the regulations of Title IX which took several years. That group of organizers then became the National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education.

I was abruptly terminated by the Reagan Administration. In August, 1982, the Coalition set up what we called a Citizens Advisory Council on Women's Education Programs. This shadow council did the kinds of things that NACWEP used to do and should do, but were not doing. We got a $20,000 grant from the Rockefeller Family Fund. With that money, I was able to put out a report, which we called Catching Up, that gave the story of CACWEP and set forth our proposed amendments towards strengthening the vocational act which was coming up for reauthorization.

We were extremely successful in getting our proposals embodied in the reauthorized WEEA, but at the end of 1983 when the grant expired, we were not successful in getting additional funding for the Citizen's Council. In early 1984, I went to work on Capitol Hill and thereafter I've not been involved in educational issues in any way.

• • • •

At the National level, the American Association of Women in Community and Junior Colleges was formed in 1974. Mildred Braupet was the first president and the headquarters for the organization was located in Phoenix, Arizona. A group of members from California developed a plan to establish a national office to monitor what was going on in the courts and in the Congress. Mildred Braupet and Eileen Rossi of San Francisco identified Claire Olson as the woman who could be of greatest help in addressing equity issues at the post-secondary level. Olson was employed by the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges in Washington, DC. Subsequently, the Association [of Women in Community and Junior Colleges] moved to DC and AACJC became its parent organization.

A proposal for funds to address women's issues was submitted to the Carnegie Foundation, which had been supportive of community college initiatives in the past. The grant, funded in June, 1976, was a baseline research activity for AACJC. Carol Eliason was hired to manage the grant. From this effort came the Center for Women's Opportunities.

> In 1973, AACJC had determined that women represented less than 30% of the enrollments of two-year colleges. The need for instant information and the requests for delivery of support services were feverish. Building on that concern the Women's Association identified the Vocational Education Act as not going far enough in addressing the real needs of the so-called 'neglected women' who wanted to go to college. The Act lacked the basic things women needed to get an education: tuition, counseling, mentors, child care, and so on.
>
> The Vocational Education Amendments were being hammered out and we wanted to infuse them into the Title IX requirements and the provisions of the Education Amendments of 1972. These laws had never been adequately implemented and they permeated all of the issues we found in our research. So we became advocates, collectors of data, information disseminators, and at the same time, we designed a reasonable legislative package.

• • • •

One of the first Federal contracts to study sex discrimination in education was awarded to Roslyn Kane. This was a study of employment practices affecting professional personnel, and included a chapter on vocational education. Kane, a consultant on sex equity issues, completed many research studies as well as providing in-service training programs and evaluating sex equity related programs and activities. She provided some of the early workshops and seminars for SECs to assist them in implementing the legislation. She received funding under the WEEA to evaluate state vocational agencies' responses to the '76 legislation and did five data analysis studies for NACWEP and NACVE in 1972, 1976, 1978, 1980 and 1982. She was involved with the review of draft legislation developed by various groups, developed guidelines for community groups to evaluate school systems regarding elimination of sex discrimination, developed model programs for non-traditional training and so on. The importance of the latter can be found in her statement.

> Professional women and women enrolled in academic programs were making progress due to the rise of the Women's Movement and the greater sensitivity of women to the issues. However, while professional women were accomplishing so much, little or no changes were being made for the non-professional women. Clearly, as long as 'all girls' were encouraged to take typing and apply for clerical and service occupations, there was little likelihood that all women would break out of the stereotypes. Without training, there was little likelihood that they would be hired for jobs that traditionally had gone to men, with or without training. The crucial importance of training to placement of women in non-traditional jobs was proven in later research. No funds were going to research the critically important issues affecting women in their selection of training for careers and the barriers to employment.
>
> Starting in the '60's with detailed research on poverty, numerous research activities produced a startling picture of the needs of women, especially in the area of employment. As a result, Congress began to address these needs but the Reagan Administration cut off much of the activity. Almost no research was funded on these issues. Little effort or interest had been undertaken in assuring that the schools moved forward. The result is that many of the gains have already been lost. For example, with few exceptions, little funding is available to fund essential counseling and child care programs. With the increased emphasis on basics, vocational education itself has lost many of its enrollees. The increase in the number of women enrolled in postsecondary vocational programs tends to be older married women with husbands at home to care for the children. It is even difficult today for a young man to obtain an apprenticeship; so for young women it is that much more difficult.

> The mixed occupations (those that have from 25 percent to 75 percent women enrolled nationally) have witnessed the greatest gains. Since many of these are service occupations; such as accounting, computer programming, medical therapists, and technicians; they are also jobs that are expanding in most areas of the country. The way the legislation is written does not encourage experimentation in mixed occupations to encourage an end to sex stereotyping.
>
> Inevitably, sooner or later the sex equity issues will be resolved. The problem is how long it will take. The combination of society, education and the individual must be aligned, to make it an easy proposition. The establishment of 'comparable worth' as a national policy, could make some of the sex equity issues less compelling. Much will also depend on the impact of the 'gender gap' that can influence how the Department of Education is likely to respond to the issue.

• • • •

Most people involved with sex equity issues have heard about, participated in a workshop offered by, or used materials developed by Amanda Smith. She continues to play a significant role as a Management and Educational Consultant in Gender Equity. At the time when the '76 Amendments were passed, she served as Director of the Division of Equal Education, North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. Her early contributions to the sex equity movement in vocational education were as Director of the New Pioneers Project, which began in 1974. This two-year project produced some of the best educational materials ever developed on sex equity and those documents were used across the nation. (In 1978, funding for the project ceased.)

> My contribution has been a philosophical approach. I developed a model of building trust between the sexes. I argued that it's the best goal. Focusing on equality tends to result in the competitive 'boys against girls hostilities' ... my goal is to develop a more comfortable working relationship in the context of trust/partnership. People feel this approach puts a positive note on their programs which enables them to work well with others.
>
> I don't think any large culture has tried so consistently to change roles of women and men. I don't think we should lose sight of the fact that extraordinary changes have happened -- amazing differences in attitudes. I'd like to think I had some part in helping that happen.

• • • •

Shirley McCune was Director of Sex Equity with the Council of Chief State School Officers when the '76 Amendments were passed. She was involved in some lobbying activities and provided early training for sex equity coordinators when they met in 1977 in Cherry Hill, New Jersey, and in 1988 in five regional conferences across the country.

> ... Those of us who had been true believers started to provide technical assistance and training in the states. Later, I received a grant to do the vocational education materials. I wrote most of the Title IX guideline materials for the [U.S.] Department of Education.

Throughout the years and currently as Senior Director of MCREL, Inc. of Aurora, Colorado, McCune has provided leadership on sex equity issues in vocational education. She is a highly respected expert who has offered training, guidance and support to many at all educational levels. Her name is synonymous with the equity movement and she continues to promote equity within all aspects of education.

> Sexism is harder to identify than racism because our thinking is organized around physical desegregation. There is little chance that schools will ever look at vocational education [for discrimination] without federal mandates. It's been difficult to pull the states along and there are individuals in states that are obviously not going to move. The mythology is that women are doing fine -- that they've moved into all areas. Most women don't even understand the issues and we just have to say that openly.

● ● ● ●

The name of Phyllis McClure was mentioned many times by numerous people on the Washington scene. Although she was involved primarily with opportunities for minorities and other at-risk populations, her influence was wide spread and impacted all equity issues. She is employed with the NAACP Legal Defense Fund. In correspondence to the author, she said:

> Although I certainly support access for women to all fields of vocational education, my chief concerns were, and remain, more targeted use of federal funds in high-poverty areas for disadvantaged students and the restriction of federal support to programs and activities which prepare students (including women) for employment. In my view, much of the vocational curriculum in secondary schools is very limited in its capacity to prepare students for the labor market.

The Fund conducted several activities in the late 1970's which included a project to monitor the implementation of the '76 Law; at the Federal level, in several states and in one local school district.

• • • •

John (Jack) Jennings was the Staff Director for the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education, the Committee in the House that considered the Vocational Amendments of '76 and the Carl D. Perkins Act of 1984. Few people on the Hill are more knowledgeable about vocational education legislation or have had more experience with the development and passage of such legislation than Jack Jennings. He is recognized as a leader and supporter by the vocational education community. His assistance and expertise were invaluable in securing acceptance and passage of the sex equity provisions in both laws.

Jennings has served as Staff Director since 1967; therefore, he was a participant in the Committee's enactment of Title IX in 1972. He stated that recognition of the need to address women's issues in the '76 Amendments happened because:

> In 1976, the women's organizations were very well organized and presented substantial data showing that vocational enrollments were overwhelmingly male or female in particular courses and that vocational teachers were overwhelmingly male or female.... in those same courses.

He indicated that one of the reasons the women's groups were so successful in securing passage of the sex equity provisions was the support they were able to garner from Congresswomen Shirley Chisholm and Patsy Mink, and Congressmen Buchanan and Miller. Another factor which helped was that:

> When we reviewed the implementation of the 1976 Amendments during the course of our reauthorization in 1983-84, we found that the sex equity provisions had begun to have an impact, but we also found that the problems were very broad and will take a long time to deal with.
>
> In 1984, the women's groups were again well organized and they were joined this time by groups representing the handicapped and the disadvantaged. Congressmen Carl Perkins and George Miller; and Senators Stafford and Hatch were very involved in identifying particular needs and creating 'set-aside' programs to meet those needs.

Jennings felt that the most significant outcome of the legislation was that the states had to address the issues of sex stereotyping and sex equity.

> Some states would have addressed the problem, but they probably would have been in a small minority. The reason is that there are so many issues to deal with that it is difficult to get attention on any one issue no matter how important.

• • • •

Nancy Kober is a government relations consultant and free lance writer in Charlottesville, Virginia. From 1975 to 1987, she was a legislative specialist on the House Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education.

> When the Congress was first considering the Amendments of '76, I had just joined the Subcommittee (September, 1975), so it was one of the first pieces of legislation that I worked on. I didn't have a great deal of experience in legislative work but I was immediately thrown into the fray. I was assigned such tasks as putting together the hearings that led up to that legislation, helping the Chairman by writing staff reports, and eventually writing a fairly large amount of the House Committee Report.

In Kober's opinion, there were several events in 1976 that contributed to the recognition by Congress that something had to be done about sex equity. The Department of Education had released data on the participation rates of women and girls in various vocational education programs which at that point were extremely sex stereotyped. Another cause for concern was the increasing awareness in the country, of the discrepancy between women's and men's income levels and a general awareness of women's rights.

• • • •

Shirley Downs spent ten years as Legislative Staff Director for Representative Shirley Chisholm of New York on the House Education Committee, and in that capacity was responsible for the Vocational Sex Equity Hearings. Representative Chisholm's office worked closely with the National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education on the Amendments and strategy for the development of the legislation. Early on they decided that they wanted to do general consciousness raising about the needs of women and the problems of women in general. The hearings were very broad. They focused not only on the sex equity issues within vocational education but the very broad programmatic implications of women not receiving appropriate education.

> Chisholm did personal letters to each member of the Subcommittee and invited them to participate. There was high participation from all members. She also made it a practice at various times to have other people chair hearings besides herself. The idea was that this was to be a teach-in and it had that kind of impact, both in terms of what happened to the Vocational Education Acts themselves and what happened in subsequent legislation. Also, there was strong participation by members of Congress. It is unusual to have five and six members listening to testimony at a Congressional hearing but that's what happened.

> The hearings focused on the rise of female heads of households and the importance of having sufficient income to support a family. Also the need for non-traditional training was stressed and tied to wages. They focused on the changing roles of family members as a result of increases in divorce and the impact of the women's movement.
>
> We made a special point during the hearings, and all persons who came to testify were told, that we did not want to have women fighting women and therefore, we wanted absolutely no negative comments on the traditional vocational women's programs. Rather, we wanted to open up other programs to women and to open traditional women's programs to men.

• • • •

Michael Brustein is well known for his active involvement with vocational education issues in general and sex equity concerns in particular. He was Attorney Advisor in the Office of General Counsel at the Education Division within the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare; and as such his client was the Deputy Commissioner for the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education.

> I came aboard with the Department of Health, Education and Welfare in 1974 when the Deputy Commissioner was William Pierce. 1974 and 1975 were two critical years because it was the beginning of a great deal of advocacy activity in Washington, DC. Later, I became the Branch Chief in the Office of General Counsel of Vocational Education. What I find particularly amusing, in retrospect, happened as we moved into '78 and '79 and became involved in the Carter Administration. Joseph Califano was then Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare. I was caught in somewhat of a cross-fire because as a lawyer, my client was the Deputy Commissioner and all the program officials who continued to be members of the old boys network. They had their own notions about Civil Rights and equity and what role the Federal Government should play -- but they were my clients! A lawyer's allegiance is to his clients and a lawyer does not make programmatic decisions. The lawyer suggests a variety of options for the client to take and then the client decides which ones they want to take. The lawyer does not decide that. Once the client makes up his or her mind, it's up to the lawyer to defend the position with zeal.
>
> I found myself in a position of being at the opposite end of the table from people like Phyllis McClure from the NAACP Legal Defense Fund and others. For example, Leslie Wolfe had taken a very strong position against long held attitudes and practices within the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education As their lawyer, I was identified as one of 'them'. There was nothing that I could do about it. I couldn't take her and others aside and say, 'Hey, I'm really on your side.'

In December '77, the Adams Order dealing with vocational education was handed down ... this was the result of a 1972 court case -- Adams vs. L. Richards. It started out as a Title VI problem with 17 southern and border states. By '77 it involved all 50 states and included Title IX as well as Section 504. Part of the consent decree that was entered in '77 was for OCR to take certain steps regarding opening up vocational education to women, the handicapped, and minorities. HEW put a task force together and developed guidelines to deal with Title IX, Title IV, and Title VI problems in vocational education. Being Branch Chief Counsel at the time, I was selected to work on these OCR guidelines. We published the guidelines in the Federal Register.

All states were required to carry out what was called the Method of Administration, or MOA, to conduct on-site civil rights compliance reviews to determine state compliance with 504. One of the requirements that we wrote into the OCR guidelines was that the sex equity coordinator was not to work on this activity, other than to the extent that he/she carries out their required activities under the Vocational Education Act. You could not assign additional responsibilities to the coordinator to carry out the MOA. This requirement was never followed by some states. Most states, back in '79 and '80, assigned the MOA responsibility to the sex equity coordinator. If you ask the current sex equity coordinators if they still work on MOA activities, you'd find many of them still do -- even though it's clear they're not supposed to. We put out the final guidelines in '79 and I left Federal Service shortly thereafter.

I began work in New York and set up a private law firm. One of my first clients was the State of New York. I helped them draft their MOA. New York, for several reasons, decided to take the whole equity movement in vocational education very, very seriously. They assigned about 20 full-time professionals to carry out the law. For the last eight years, I've been working with several state education agencies with regard to their equity concerns in the area of vocational education.

I've worked as a pro bono attorney on major court cases which affect vocational education in the area of equity ... generally I speak to the coordinators each year to give them updates on various bills that affect them, plus court cases and administrative decisions which impact on their work. I've developed a very good relationship with the equity coordinators, but it's for the most part pro bono. It's something I do because I'm interested in it. There are a handful of states that I do workshops for so I just try to stay involved as much as I can.

> I worked with the Hill on the drafting of the Perkins Act of '84. I was involved primarily with the provisions dealing with the handicapped and disadvantaged. I worked with both the House and Senate Committees. I tried to give them insight as to what I viewed as the real significant problems with the '76 Bill and changes that needed to be made. I think that most people would say in retrospect that had Carl Perkins not passed away in an untimely fashion, the bill would have been much different and much closer to what the House had introduced. After his passing, the House really didn't have 'the champion' in vocational education that it needed.

• • • •

As the primary professional organization for most vocational educators, the American Vocational Association has been in the forefront in lobbying for federal legislation. Much of that responsibility fell on the shoulders of Dean Griffin.

> In 1976, I was serving on the staff of AVA as Director of Legislation. It was my responsibility to coordinate the AVA into a legislative program and to work with Congress as they passed the '76 Amendments. In 1984 my responsibilities were the same with the exception of having moved more into the legislative arena and having more responsibility for direct legislative input into the Congress on behalf of vocational education. Working for AVA, I was the staff person directly responsible for all vocational education issues; responsible for communicating to the field as well as with the Congress, and coordinating the involvement of vocational educators into the legislative process.
>
> Also, I was involved in the development of the amendments to Title IX. Again, it was the Coalition of Women and Girls in Education, plus other women lobbyists, who were involved. Educating members on the Committee about women's issues in general did help us. Also, Representative Edith Green, who was Chair of the Higher Education Committee, was critical of the process used with the Higher Education Act Amendments and wanted a change.

• • • •

The first person to serve at the Federal level in an official capacity as an "advocate with a title" for sex equity in vocational education was Deborah Ashford. While employed as Assistant Director of Women's Studies at the University of Alabama, Leroy Cornielson asked her to prepare a bibliography on non-traditional occupations and opportunities for women and provided her with a grant of $1,800 to complete the task. In January, 1976 she was asked to come to Washington to expand the bibliography. She remained for a year and a half.

Ashford proposed to William Pierce, then Deputy Commissioner for BOAE in HEW, that her responsibilities be expanded, particularly in the area of women in vocational education.

> I thought there was a problem and wanted to be a part of identifying what it was. I'll never forget what Bill Pierce said to me. 'You are completely wrong, but since you've only been here for two weeks, I will give you the benefit of the doubt and I won't fire you. In fact, I will give you a vote of confidence. I am going to name you my Special Advisor on Women's Issues and I'm going to give you free rein to go out and see what you can come up with.' That was in February, 1976.

Subsequently, Ashford traveled the country giving speeches and workshops on equity and learning what the real problems were.

> ... The way things worked was that I was in a position to have some responsibility and more opportunities than anyone else to push the ideas that were in the new legislation with the establishment and with people within the Office of Education. ... Also, time was spent getting to know the women leaders on the Washington scene who had similar interests and concerns. The first person I met was Margaret Dunkle and then I met Cindy Brown ... they put me in touch with Phyllis McClure, I met many people during that first year I was in Washington.
>
> BOAE designed a program review strategy to include race, sex, and handicapped equity issues rather than doing separate reviews on each area. The first responsibility that I took on was to take the Title IX regulations and attempt to define how they apply to vocational education. What I did was to take Civil Rights and Title IX and put them into our regular program review so that when somebody from adult education or vocational education did a program audit they could add the Title IX review checklist. It was something that was unheard of, but I got a great deal of cooperation throughout the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education to do this.

(Joseph Califano, then Secretary of HEW, became interested in this integrated model. As a result, Deborah Ashford moved over to the Office for Civil Rights to incorporate the concept throughout HEW.)

Ashford went on to say:

> It was significant that a small group of women came together at the right time. It was a rare combination of dedicated, concerned, single-minded, well-educated women who, for the most part, had little or no vocational education experience.

> They were all about the same age and had gone to college in the late sixties. Several had experience with race issues and they felt that Title IX could serve as the mechanism for identifying problems in other areas.

• • • •

From 1977-1979, Sheryl Dembo was the Sex Equity Specialist in BOAE. During her tenure, the office provided a series of inservice training programs for sex equity coordinators. The Coolfant meeting was held in 1978. This was the first BOAE sponsored conference for SEC's.

In October, 1979, Barbara Bitters, Sex Equity Coordinator in the State of Wisconsin arrived in Washington, DC on an Inter- governmental Personnel Act agreement for one year. Previously, she had been a lecturer in the Women's Studies Program at the University of Wisconsin and was Assistant Director of a WEEA grant at the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction.

As with most people new to the Washington scene, Bitters needed to become better acquainted with those who supported sex equity issues.

> I reached out to a lot of women's organizations. I started the first week making the rounds and meeting the people who were at NACWEP, NACVE, PEER and the National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education.
>
> The person I worked most closely with in the Coalition was Janet Wells at the Federal Education Project. She was clearly the most knowledgeable about vocational education. In 1979, the OCR guidelines came down and the women's groups were monitoring that process also. I remember meeting ... Cindy Marano at Wider Opportunities for Women and Holly Knox at PEER [Director]. Theresa Cusick was just getting involved in vocational education issues ... Robin Gordon was Editor of the PEER Perspectives Newsletter. Someone else who was in town was Roz Kane. She had gotten the contract to do the '80 and '81 study. The contract was issued by NACWEP and NACVE, the Advisory Councils for Women's Education Programs and Vocational Education. They wanted a study done on what had happened since the '76 Amendments. I met often with Jill Miller.
>
> Sue Klein was over at NIE at that time so I met with her on several occasions. She'd been doing some other kind of sex equity research and writing. I just tried, when I went there to meet as many of the women's organization people as I could.

Most of her year as leader of the sex equity effort in the Bureau was expended on reauthorization activities.

> When I arrived in DC in 1979, the USOE, BOAE was already involved in determining some of its positions relative to reauthorization and doing some studies, including the Congressionally mandated study of Vocational Education. People were writing in and the AVA was beginning its process. The sex equity coordinators had two vehicles for providing input; through VEEC ... and the National Leadership Development Conference (NLDC), in which I was involved.

• • • •

Harriet Medaris, Education Program Specialist in USOE from 1979-80 to 1983 saw the Federal role with the state sex equity coordinators as one of 'partnership'. Workshops, national conferences, telephone conferences and monthly newsletters were used to share information on legislation, successes and programs.

> I spoke at conferences of women's organizations on the progress being made through vocational education programs and through networking with the local groups of the Displaced Homemakers Network, Inc. Coordination with local groups at the grass-roots level was key to finding local solutions.
>
> Information on sex equity programs was provided to the Assistant Secretary of Education for Public Affairs, Liz Carpenter, for use in speeches made in various states. When the Secretary of Education, Shirley Hutstedler, visited vocational schools, information was provided to her as well.
>
> During this period, representatives of four nations visited the Department of Education to discuss vocational education legislative provisions for women and the programs in the states. The head of a vocational technical school in the U.K., two advisors to cabinet officers in France and Denmark and a representative from the National Women's Committee in the U.S.S.R. made up the group.

In the '80s, Federal agencies were beginning to work together more often than in the past. For example, the Women's Bureau, Department of Labor, shared information on education and employment. The military service provided information on family support groups to create a link with vocational education and women in the military and enlisted men's wives.

• • • •

From July, 1985 to July, 1986, John Siebert Dalton served as Sex Equity Coordinator in the Department of Vocational Education, Office of Education. It was her responsibility to monitor states to see that equity coordinators were allowed to do the job they were hired to do.

The sex equity supervisor from Illinois, Jane E. Adair became the Program Specialist - Sex Equity in the U.S. Department of Education in 1987. She had been a leader in the Vocational Education Equity Council and served as president during that same year. These were not easy times for anyone involved with special populations or discrimination issues at the Federal level. Cutbacks in domestic spending and a general attitude of having lost support from the Federal administration permeated the environment. Adair remained on the job for less than one year. As of this writing, her position has not been filled. Responsibility for sex equity was assigned to another individual in the department who has little support for the many programs she is assigned to administer.

• • • •

Other individuals within the federal offices that were cited as playing significant roles in the implementation of the legislation follow:

> Any history that's written [about sex equity] describing the success or expectations, laudable expectations of the effort, is going to have to bring into sharp focus the role that Bill Pierce played. Many of the folks who gave Deborah Ashford the kind of data that she needed to portray the issues for the leadership within the Department deserve recognition. I would also point to Ted Bell [Commissioner, Office of Education, HEW] because Bill Pierce would not have had such an easy time of it had he not had the support of Ted at the time.
>
> I happen to believe that as a rule implementer there was one person there [in USOE] who was really totally unbiased with respect to the roles of women in Vocational Education and with women in his office; that's LeRoy Cornielson. I never found the time when he treated anyone unfairly nor did he ever take the soft side of the issue with regard to implementation. He was a champion for this movement and I think maybe he hasn't been recognized as adequately as he might have been. Lee has a history of being a hard rulemaker and enforcer and in this case it was absolutely necessary, and he did that job.

• • • •

Mary Lovell, a long time employee in the United States Office of Education/Department of Education was a program analyst in planning in 1976. She served as program officer for several sex equity projects including contracts with the National Center for Research in Vocational Education at Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio. Also, she worked with the contractors who developed a Title IX Handbook. Her current title is Educational Research Advisor, U.S. Department of Education.

• • • •

Laura Greenberg-Johns was an Education Program Specialist in the U.S. Office of Education/Department of Education, Region III in 1976. She was involved with the early conferences for sex equity coordinators. These events were funded by the Education Profession Development Act (EPDA), Section 553 and monies were funneled through the Maryland State Department of Education to cover the cost of the meetings.

• • • •

Daniel Dunham served as Deputy Commissioner for Occupational and Adult Education in the Carter Administration. He later became Assistant Secretary for Vocational and Adult Education. Prior to coming to Washington, he had been the State Director of Vocational Education in Maryland and was a recognized leader in vocational education. During the early days of his tenure, Title IX and the Education Amendments of 1976 were important pieces of legislation which demanded attention. Dunham was supportive of sex equity. His colleagues said:

> Dan Dunham remains one of the few men in Vocational Education who I think really understood the issues and was willing to say, 'I am a feminist; I believe in this!'
>
> He (Dunham) definitely was supportive. I heard him say, 'we need to talk about equity for both boys and girls, but let's be real! The people who have really been discriminated against are the females and we need to focus on them.'
>
> Dunham reaffirmed these endorsements (and his philosophy).
>
> I could be named as one of the people who was verbal and outspoken about equity issues and I hope provided the kind of leadership that helped keep the thing moving. I am a feminist, a declared feminist, and one of the few men who was willing to say that, and still am. I still speak about the issue ... in some states the issues is still not terribly popular.

• • • •

In 1976, it was the responsibility of the BAVE in the USOE to write the regulations for the Vocational Amendments of 1976. At that time, Charles Buzzell was Associate Commissioner of Vocational Education. In the mid '80s, he became Director of Policy Analysis in the Office of Vocational and Adult Education, U.S. Department of Education (currently he is Executive Director of AVA).

> It was my job to direct the writing of the regulations for both the Vocational Amendments of '76 and the Perkins Act. ... One might describe my involvement as being responsible for regulation and development as opposed to getting the Act passed.

Buzzell shared his views on the most significant outcomes of the legislation :

> I think that having embedded in national policy the expectations that we have for men and women, boys and girls to pursue careers of choice, freed-up from stereotypic thinking, is probably the most significant achievement that historians will record for the effort.

• • • •

The current Executive Director of the Center for Women's Policy Studies, Leslie R. Wolfe, became Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary for Education in HEW in 1977. She also served as Deputy Director of the Women's Rights Program, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights and as Director of PEER and WEEA.

> When I came to Washington, I ended up at the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights as Deputy Director of the Women's Rights Program, in '73. I'd already volunteered my time at the Center for Policy Studies that had just started. I was lucky enough to get the job at the Commission just as it was beginning to deal with sex discrimination. We worked on lots of issues, ranging from getting WEEA passed and implemented (of course, we didn't do so well in getting it funded) to medical experimentation on women, sterilization abuse, housing, credit, etc. All that was quite exciting. I became involved with vocational education when Mary Berry became Assistant Secretary for Education in HEW in the Carter Administration. We had worked together at the Commission. She had been a consultant on an abortion report and we had become friends. I became her special assistant working on women's issues and civil rights.
>
> It was the Spring or Summer of '78 when these regulations came through ('76 Amendments). The only power the Assistant Secretary had was the power of clearance. It was a small office relative to the size of the Office of Education. The Office of Education felt that it should have complete and total freedom to do everything it wanted. However, they had an Assistant Secretary who took her role very seriously and also took seriously the mandate to do something about discrimination.

• • • •

Ruth Nadel, a long term employee of the Women's Bureau in the Department of Labor, was a member of the National Advisory Council for Women's Education Programs, representing the Women's Bureau. The Council's function was to improve educational opportunities for women and girls. The members were nationally appointed figures who were truly interested in seeing that such opportunities existed. Ms. Nadel had a background in vocational education having taught at a high school in a metropolitan city.

> A number of my students were from first generation immigrant families and they were very serious about their school work and wanting to get ahead. They had the choice of majoring in either accounting, stenography and typing, or distributive education.
>
> Many of these youngsters were what we would consider the 'at-riskers' of today. I could see from the way they behaved that they were eager to learn. I taught for several years and I never had a day when I wasn't excited about my classes. The original cooperative education concept was started in this school. Students went to school for the 'A week' while the 'B week' students were at work. It was like a job sharing situation. I want you to know that this was a good 35 years or so ago.

She discussed the role of the Women's Bureau and its contributions to sex equity throughout the years.

> In the Women's Bureau, our role is to create awareness, to co-sponsor conferences and to try to bring to the attention of the public any legislation that they should be aware of. We try to find out where the gaps are and what services are needed. The Bureau offers workshops at the local level in an attempt to reach people who can make a difference; to get people to raise their sights and understand the value of good counseling for females, to look at what the community has to offer, to find gaps in services, and to find good local leaders. Also, the Bureau works with national groups and other government agencies concerned about women's issues.
>
> The Bureau receives many calls for background information from researchers, graduate students and people who are developing proposals. We don't always generate the information but know where to get it. We produce fact sheets on progress on women's issues such as, Federal Job Training Programs and Vocational Education Legislation that Benefits Women. In the past, the Bureau did not have much contact with the Department of Education but recently we re-established some linkages and are working together on various conferences.
>
> One of the things that seems to have happened in the last ten or twelve years, is the whole matter of women getting together in self-help groups. For example, here in Washington

> we have a federation of organizations for professional women which includes many different kinds of members, associations, networks, etc ... I've been a member for five or six years ... and the focus of the group has changed. They do a lot of training now and are beginning to charge for it. It used to be, 'Learn How to Dress Better,' but now they are actually holding seminars to help women understand the fact that they must support each other and develop skills. You see women moving together and assisting each other. I really think this is because we worked together so diligently in the '70s and were successful.

• • • •

Cindy Marano, a leader in supporting the '84 legislation was first involved in organizing a National Displaced Homemakers Network, and served as its first president. The Network completed a number of projects to try to get a handle on how the '76 legislation was being implemented in regard to funding displaced homemakers' programs around the country.

> What we learned, of course, was that since this wasn't a mandated expenditure almost nothing was really happening. So I began to be very interested in what we could do about the '76 legislation. In 1980, I moved to WOW (Wider Opportunities for Women) to become the Director of the WOW National Network and began to collect data through the Network, looking not just at displaced homemaker issues but also at non-traditional programming under the Vocational Education Act. I joined the Coalition for Women and Girls in Education as WOW's representative and soon became the Co-Chairperson of the Task Force on Vocational Education, with Theresa Cusick. That's when I began to get involved with the development of the Perkins Act.
>
> The Coalition had built a case in terms of what was going on in the states. I think that we brought a little bit different approach to the issue. I was mentored in the women's movement by a woman named Tish Summers, who was the founder of the displaced homemakers movement. She told me that you always start with much more than you expect. We sold the Coalition on taking a bold approach, even though there was some concern that maybe we would get 'spanked' for it. We decided to take the risk.

• • • •

A key player in the reauthorization of the '76 Amendments, Theresa Cusick, was co-chair (with Cindy Marano) of the NCWGE Task Force on Vocational Education. Cusick was employed by PEER in 1978 when the Coalition was just beginning to think about the next go-around for the '76 Act.

> There was a working Vocational Education Task Force of the National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education which Janet Wells chaired. Janet was a grand person. She was the person who knew everything about vocational education, the in's and out's of the vocational education system, and the legislation. She worried about the reauthorization when nobody else did. She developed proposals and talked with key people early on. It was under Janet's leadership that we began discussing what we wanted for the new law.

• • • •

Mary Shannon was part of the team that worked on the Coalition's initiatives. She said that some people who opposed the legislation called her a 'rabble rouser', but she indicated that if you saw her you wouldn't believe it. This statement was clarified by one of her colleagues who said, "Mary is 40 something, she has white hair and looks like a nice, sweet little housewife. In some ways, she was disarming -- which made her very effective."

• • • •

Jill Miller of the Displaced Homemaker Network shared how the network became involved with the vocational legislation.

> Tish Summers and Laura Shields, founders of the Displaced Homemakers Network, were traveling around the country, organizing women who were involved in displaced homemakers' issues, and it just struck a nerve. By that time, a lot of us had been through the early stages of feminism, had read The Feminine Mystique, had done our consciousness raising, and it was time to enter the political arena. The issues in vocational education were directly related to the concern of the Network. It was a natural thing to support the sex equity provisions of the Act.
>
> Back then, there were enough of them [women on the Washington scene] that were sophisticated and experienced enough to get something done, but in many ways they were inexperienced and very naive. Maybe that was helpful because they didn't know not to ask or not to try.... What's so amazing to me ... is that it happened here [in DC]... Who would have predicted in '72 that it would be vocational education ... that would be the basis of so much [change].

• • • •

Currently, the Executive Director of NASDVE is a woman. Madeline Hemmings has a background in industrial and labor relations and had been employed by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Alliance of Business. She has a strong interest in strengthening the bond between vocational educators and employers.

> I think if vocational education people and employers would really work together they wouldn't have much to worry about in terms of their financial or political future - but I don't think it's all been worked out yet. To prepare people for work, we must be involved in the economy's competitive bazaar. People who need employees are nobody's fools. They will support vocational education.

When asked about her selection as Director of NASDVE, she replied:

> They hired me because I was competent. Someone said to me that this was seen as a great advance in terms of sex equity. However, my experience with the state directors is that they are not terribly closed-minded. The more I hear, the more respect I have for them; it grows rather than diminishes ... they are really fine people. They are trying very, very hard. They get attacked from every side, by every interest group. It's no picnic. It might be a lot more comfortable to be the assistant state director. You have to admire people who are directors. I don't find an environment [within NASDVE] of anti-anybody; either anti-women, anti-black, or anti-anything.

• • • •

In 1988, Mary Ann Millsap completed her doctoral dissertation, entitled Advocates for Sex Equity in Federal Education Law: The National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education (50). This comprehensive study includes an excellent discussion of the Coalition's involvement in the 1976 Amendments and in their continued lobbying efforts for the passage of the Carl Perkins Act in 1984.

Currently, Millsap is a Senior Research Associate with Abt Associates, Inc., Cambridge, Massachusetts. She was project director for that portion of the National Assessment of Vocational Education (NAVE) that dealt with state and local responses to the Perkins Act. Also, she evaluated the implementation of the single parent and sex equity provisions of the Act. The NAVE resulted in five volumes and four of the final documents were published in August, 1989. See highlights from this assessment in the Appendix.

From 1968 to 1973, Millsap worked with the Office of Education's Planning and Evaluation Office on vocational education evaluations. In 1972, the Commissioner of Education, at the request of the Secretary of HEW, Elliot Richardson, began to look at sex discrimination in education. Millsap was part of the task force established to follow through on the Secretary's request. In 1978, shortly after the '76 Amendments were passed, Millsap also worked temporarily for Mary Berry, the Assistant Secretary of Education as the government responded to the recommendations from the International Women's Year.

> There were both an Intergovernmental Task Force on Women and a National Advisory Committee on Women, and I was a consultant to each of those bodies on vocational education and occupational segregation, looking at the implications of the '76 Amendments and sex desegregation in the Department of Labor programs. I was also involved with sex equity and vocational education when I went to the Institute [NIE] and worked in the Education and Work Group, headed by Cory Rieder. Cory was very committed to making sure that career interest inventories were not sex-biased.
>
> I was always a researcher. I knew a bunch of the people who were more active in the advocacy camp because they were my friends, especially through Holly Knox. I'm sure you've found that the Coalition really got going through these friendship networks. I didn't really play any role in any of the advocacy work around either the '76 Amendments or Carl Perkins.

• • • •

In addition to the Coalition, other women's groups became involved in the reauthorization of the Carl Perkins Act during the late 1980's. One of these groups, AAUW, prepared a position paper which included specific recommendations for strengthening the sex equity provisions of the Act (see Appendix). This is significant because:

> We're an organization primarily of upper middle class women who believe we have an absolute responsibility to make a difference for everyone in America. (AAUW President, Sarah Harder)

In December, 1988, at a VEEC meeting at AVA in St. Louis, Missouri, Sarah Harder, President of the Association of University Women, presented an overview of the Association's concern for the reauthorization (highlights follow).

> We have an interest in the reauthorization of the Vocational Education Amendments as do other organizations that comprise the national machinery which volunteer women's organizations have put together by themselves these past ten years.... When President Reagan came into office, he dismantled the only national machinery that we had -- a Federal Commission [on the Status of] Women. That Commission had been in place since being appointed by President Kennedy. Frankly, at

this point, we are the only nation in the world that lacks formal government machinery overseeing equity issues for women. What that meant was that women's organizations themselves had to become the national machinery, starting in 1982. We have done so. And we have done it out of our back pockets. As a matter of fact, we've done pretty darn well putting it together. Recently, we organized a Council of Presidents of national women's organizations located in Washington, which brings together the heads of 44 very diverse national groups, ranging from groups like the Displaced Homemakers' Network, to the National Council of Negro Women and the Black Women's Agenda. We came together on a monthly basis to plan our agenda based on what is at the forefront in the Congress of the United States, and issues of concern to the Administration.

We work with the National Coalition of Women and Girls in Education. This group is really the sort of centralized expertise for the women's movement on this issue [vocational education] in Washington. But the fact is many organizations have had a long commitment to equity and recognize the need to use the expertise available and get behind an issue and move the agenda. Why? Because we know that in the past ten years there's been a vast change in the lives of women. Women are two out of three of the new work force entrants and women are also two out of three of this nation's poor. That tells us something about the good and the bad of the past ten years.... The bottom line is that vocational education plays a crucial role in preparing young women for labor force participation and economic self-sufficiency... We believe that education needs to be an engine for change and the reauthorization of the Vocational Education Act provides the logical opportunity for us to get an Act together, get it on the track, get as many cars behind it as we can, and finally begin to deliver the institutional change that we know is necessary.

I'm convinced that, as women's organizations and as advocates from within the vocational education community, we have to stop preaching to the choir and we have to go beyond the congregation. And that means reaching out in our own backyards to find and connect others who can be converted. I'm convinced that there are lots of people ready to be converted just as there are lots of others who are similarly committed.

The problem is that an awful lot of us who worked in these territories don't see ourselves as movers and shakers. Traditionally, we are not the corporate CEO's or the agency heads, or the elected officials -- the people whose single word can mobilize resources and make people jump to attention. But I argue that those of us who have savvy, caring, connection, and a real sense of responsibility for this issue can do something. The kind of power that we represent can't do it alone, but without our power and without our initiative, and without our credibility, it will never happen. So instead of focusing on our differences which we all know are there, and which paralyze us in the status quo, I think we have to build some new connections, and I think we've got lots of possibilities. We need to build a force of our expertise which takes advantage of the differences represented and makes new allies out of old adversaries. We need to work with state and county agencies which pool the authority and inside knowledge, as well as the red tape of government. We need to connect with community-based organizations which retain some independence from bureaucracies and still know how to serve special constituencies. We need to involve teachers and educators who know how pressed our schools are, but who can also advocate from within. We need to work with elected officials and their staffs to help them see both cost-benefit results and humane public policy, if they've got the courage to resist the opposition. We need to recruit representatives from corporations and foundations who could share resources and credibility in an effort to increase public awareness. Finally, we need to engage the leaders of public service and advocacy organizations, groups that really don't have an axe to grind, but who can become matchmakers among agencies and policy makers, even if we've got to do it with a shotgun or two. We are the people who are ready to be friendly watch dogs' for accountability ... to be a responsible voice for the silent majority.

We think that the public is ready to move on this issue. We've seen an incredible mind change in the past ten years. Ninety percent of the public now, male and female, agree to the premise of self-sufficiency for women. It is only a step beyond that consciousness shift to their beginning to demand that our educational system deliver on the promise of economic self-sufficiency for women. We believe that with a new administration and a president who says he will be the education president, with the reauthorization as the train on the track, with public consciousness, and with the incredible reservoir of expertise and creativity that is present here; women will deliver this time around. It's coming down the track and just watch us ... watch our smoke. (From audio-tape of presentation.)

• • • •

New York State was the first to appoint a sex equity coordinator, thus Carol Jabonaski became the first coordinator funded under the 1976 Amendments. Oklahoma was second with the appointment of Fern Green who later became the first President of the VEEC. Currently, she is Executive Director of the Oklahoma Advisory Council on Vocational

Education. Green gave credit to Shirley McCune and Louise Vetter for their support and leadership in implementing the law, for providing assistance to sex equity coordinators and for giving credibility to the movement, especially during the early days.

Utah was the last state in the country to appoint a sex equity coordinator, and then only under pressure from the federal government; so said Barbara Hales, Sex Equity Specialist for the state, and one of the few original coordinators still serving in the position.

> I don't think the Feds had ever threatened punitive action against a state like they did in this case. Utah was resistant, and they tried to split the job between two people. Finally the Federal Government said absolutely not. One January morning they [Utah state personnel] got a phone call saying you either have a full time sex equity specialist on board by next Monday or you will not receive any federal vocational dollars.
>
> I was on my way downstate to visit a home economics program when I received a call from the State Superintendent who said, 'You've got to come down here and clean out your office We don't want any vestiges of home economics left ... You are to be the new state sex equity coordinator.' I was just stunned! That was in January, 1978.
>
> About that time, some interesting things were happening in the state. I'd been involved with women's issues for a long time. I had been labeled by some as a liberal feminist because of my stand on some issues, but I viewed myself as a moderate. I went to the job with a great deal of ambivalence. I thought it was going to be an interesting job and it has been ever since.

Hales was extremely active in the passage of the Carl Perkins Act since Senator Orrin Hatch of Utah was sponsor of the bill in the Senate.

Linda Beane of Arkansas was a leader during the first two years that VEEC existed. She spent time in Washington, DC working with members of Congress to be sure that the rules and regulations of the '76 Amendments were acceptable to the VEEC membership.

Marie Mayor of Maryland has been involved with sex equity legislative issues for many years.

> My roots are truly at the grassroots level and I am thoroughly committed to empowering community based organizations to advocate [for] vocational sex equity.

She joined the Maryland State Department of Education in August, 1977, with a background of varied experience in the political arena.

> I had been Head Start Program Director, was working on the State Commission for Women, and had been a consultant writing a pamphlet on how to get appointed to the Commission.

> I had worked at the State Legislature for the Women's Caucus in the legislature, and I had also been a project director for the Racial Desegregation Program in 1973. I worked with parents and students, and I was already involved in the women's movement in 1973-74. I also lobbied for Title IX; I met with Congressman Perkins, who was in his seventies, when we were trying to get the Congress to force the Department of HEW to issue the guidelines for Title IX. I was active in the League of Women Voters and Chair of their Education Committee which was part of the validation for my credentials when I got the job at the State Department of Education. I was President of the Prince Georges County Women's Political Caucus; and we would go to Capitol Hill and lobby. I think I was lobbying in 1973. I was also an elected member of the College Park City Council.

Currently, Mayor is Section Chief, State Planning Finance and Facilities, Division of Vocational Technical Education, Maryland State Department of Education. Because of her location, interest, and expertise, she worked more closely with the Washington-based advocacy groups.

> Many of us who participated in the movement were women who had time, were educated, were well-read, and had been involved in the Civil Rights Movement. The Civil Rights Movement dramatically changed what happened to me as a woman. So the women's movement was just a natural to complement all the things that I had done in the Civil Rights Movement.

Indepth feedback on the early days and subsequent progress from a SEC's viewpoint was provided by: Mary Ann Etu, New York; Nishma Duffy, New Hampshire; Nancy Evans, Ohio; Carol Mayhew, Delaware; Beverly Postlewaite, Washington and Ella Stolz, South Dakota.

The leadership of VEEC was active, if not aggressive, in supporting legislative initiatives prior to the '84 legislation. The names of the officers of the organization can be found in Chapter III.

• • • •

As has been stated previously in this document, it is difficult to reach and include everyone who was involved with the legislation. It was not our intent to overlook any individual or groups. We apologize to those who should have been contacted but we didn't know about their contributions, or their names were brought to our attention too late to include in the study. We regret that some important people did not respond or chose not to participate in the study.

CHAPTER V

OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

> Most of all, sex equity has to do with tapping and developing talent in people, for the sake of individuals and the collective health and vitality of our society. [Sex Equity Coordinator]

There is no doubt that progress has been made in eliminating sex discrimination, sex bias and sex stereotyping in vocational education programs and services as a result of the federal vocational education legislation. As a nation, we are more aware of the problem and many exciting activities have taken place at all levels, within a variety of institutions. Those people who worked so hard on behalf of the women and girls in this nation can be proud of their accomplishments. Yet, there is still reason for concern.

Eighteen years ago, Title IX was passed and it has been 14 years since the Vocational Amendments of 1976 became law. Why has progress been so slow? Why is "the issue" still "an issue"? This study has supplied some of the answers to those questions. It is hoped that everyone concerned with providing equal opportunities for all people wanting and needing vocational education programs and services will give consideration to the facts and opinions presented in this document. A few significant observations/recommendations follow:

Having been employed in a state education agency for fifteen years and being in a leadership position in vocational education when the '76 Amendments were passed, this author has some understanding of the frustrations, problems, and changes which resulted from this landmark legislation.

In my opinion, the most significant change was that the Division of Vocational Education, or whatever the unit was called, moved from a leadership, advocacy, and assistance role to one of administration and monitoring. At the time, I was employed in a small state and we had been able to build close ties, trust and a helping relationship with local districts. The '76 Amendments changed that with its many requirements; local plans, accountability reports, new funding procedures, evaluation procedures, and set-aside funding for sex equity.

This is not to say that most of the new requirements weren't necessary. The problem was that the multiplicity of mandates created a negative environment within the states for many reasons, and specifically as related to sex equity issues. Sex equity became the scapegoat, in many instances, for the frustrations which resulted from a perceived lack of control. This was complicated by a limited understanding of the issue and lack of expertise/skills to address the problems. Thus the "tried and true" became even more important to maintain. An already overburdened staff, most of whom perceived themselves as helpers or facilitators had to become enforcers -- and they didn't like it! The common response was, "Those damn feminists caused all of the problems! They took our money, our time, our plans, our security, and our confidence and expected us to move over and let it happen". All of this took place at a time when Federal and state funding for education was being questioned and subsequently decreased, and those who said "no new taxes" were getting the votes. Hard decisions had to be made and fewer resources were available.

Many people involved in this study said that the traditional vocational education community, especially the leadership, did not "read" the attitude, intent and expectations of Congress relative to sex discrimination in vocational education and employment. Also, in reviewing materials for this study, especially records of the hearings, it was obvious that Congress was concerned about women's issues and was disturbed and angry with the limited attention and progress given to women and girls by vocational educators. Lobbying by the powerful vocational groups to maintain and expand "customary practice" didn't work and eroded the trust Congress had in the vocational establishment. Even more significant is the fact that other professional groups and organizations may have achieved greater power to influence future legislative initiatives. In the future, vocational education will need to build new bridges and alliances and become more flexible about what it wants versus what is possible to obtain in federal legislation.

It was evident that Congress was not interested in maintaining vocational programs and services. The needs of "at-risk" populations and groups not being served "grabbed their attention" and will continue to do so. It is essential that old hostilities be put aside. Cooperation between the vocational education community and equity advocacy groups is needed in order to maintain funding levels and to show Congress that vocational education is concerned about all populations. In addition, it is important to realize how instrumental women's issues were in securing passage of the '76 and '84 vocational education Federal legislation, not just the sex equity, homemakers and single parent provisions.

Significant progress can only be realized when local and state agencies "believe and act". Perhaps too much emphasis is given to things that cost money. State and local agencies say they cannot afford changes and hold on to old attitudes. The commitment to a philosophy that all persons will be treated equally is not a "costly" one. Activities, policies, procedures, declarations, actions, and so on, which promote sex equity, can be undertaken if people believe. There will never be enough money!

There are many positive signs of progress. Various groups have prepared position papers for the reauthorization of the Carl Perkins Act and are supportive of the sex equity provisions in the law. Many exciting activities and programs have been developed. However, there are people and groups who still categorize sex equity issues under special populations (ie., handicapped, disadvantaged). This is fascinating in light of the fact that the majority of our students are female. Women and girls are an under-served majority, not a special population. Displaced homemakers and single parents, populations funded under the law, are special populations. However, sex discrimination, bias and stereotyping are generalized, pervasive issues which cannot be resolved by a program.

States have been quite successful in serving the needs of special populations (ie., single parents, displaced homemakers) and adult women in community based and post-secondary settings. It has been easier to do this than to stimulate public schools to become involved. However, we must not and cannot afford to forget our youth who attend public schools and who are our future leaders and taxpayers. The earlier we can reach them, the better.

The Coalitions formed to support passage of the sex equity provisions in the law were needed and effective. It is often said that change comes slowly. Realizing this, those who were committed to eliminating sex discrimination in vocational education were in it for the "long haul". They realized the value and power of a group effort, selected effective leaders, and developed a long range strategy for change. They were relentless in their efforts to achieve their goals. It is suggested that other national and state advocacy groups study their strategies and strengthen current efforts to influence decision makers.

Another strategy which has and will continue to be effective in obtaining federal funds for sex equity, is to show congressional and state representatives how they can secure more votes by supporting women's issues. Those that are concerned about the issues need to realize that many of the Washington based women's groups are having difficulty "keeping afloat". Several participants stressed the point that if we lose the support of these groups we will lose our advocates and then where will we be? Also, these groups have other agendas than vocational education. It would be exciting and encouraging to see a broad spectrum of vocational educators take on an active advocacy role for women and girls in vocational education.

The availability of statistical data was critical to the passage of both the '76 Amendments and the Carl Perkins Act. Congress and advocacy groups used these data to highlight the problems of stereotyping in vocational education. It behooves states to pay particular attention to the type, scope and accuracy of information collected on females. Decision makers want and use this information. Support from Congress, with dollars attached, will not be forthcoming without adequate statistical back-up. Documentation by clients of the benefits they received from vocational programs and services is extremely effective in obtaining Federal funds.

In the future, the degree of attention paid to sex equity issues will depend, to a large degree, on how these issues impact on the economy. Therefore, it will be important to focus on such concerns as welfare, child care, women and poverty, teenage parents, etc. and stress how these problems affect the taxpayers' pocketbook. Emphasis should be given to the need for providing training which will increase the incomes of women, how bias and discrimination inhibits women's ability to achieve higher paying jobs and promotions, and the economic benefits to the individual, state and nation.

The Women's Movement has been labeled by many as a white women's movement. Many at-risk women are black and hispanic. An effort must be made to get these populations involved in the issues and in finding solutions to their own problems. Also, vocational education is seen as a dead-end program to many black parents and they want more for their children. Vocational education must get a message to minority groups that vocational programs provide opportunities for all people, both males and females.

It has been found that many women who need non-traditional jobs to sustain an adequate lifestyle have the most traditional attitudes toward jobs and work. States should increase their efforts to reach these women with resources and training. This will require closer cooperation with business and industry and the development of innovative approaches for reaching women who need the most help. Another weakness that was identified is that women who are participating in job training programs are not receiving adequate follow up once trained for non-traditional jobs. They need assistance and support in adjusting to the male dominated business/industrial culture.

It is a fact of life that in our society many women will not elect or desire to enroll in a non-traditional occupational training program. As long as most of the attention is focused on women entering non-traditional fields, the traditional female occupations will be ignored (by design or oversight). The issues of equal pay and low salaries in traditional female occupations are not being addressed as they should be. Those really concerned about sex equity must address these issues now or the social and economic well-being of families in the state and nation will continue to deteriorate.

Teachers teach as they have been taught and most are unaware of the overt or subtle way they reinforce stereotypical attitudes and beliefs in the classroom. More emphasis must be placed on how we can help teachers, both male and female, become aware of the impact they have on their students. The same applies to local administrators. They control what happens in the school and have a responsibility to ensure that sex bias, discrimination and stereotyping are eliminated.

A great many awareness activities are still taking place. The time has come to move beyond awareness and provide more programs and services. Vocational education programs have been effective in many states, especially those designed to educate and prepare women for employment. Special attention needs to be placed on obtaining state resources to support these effective programs. We know what works, let's do more of it!

Who the sex equity coordinator reports to within the state hierarchy makes a difference. The sex equity coordinator is an administrator (under law) and must have access to the state director, have the authority to do the job, and be involved in the decision-making process to be effective. The coordinator's responsibilities are clearly stated in the law and do not include responsibility for Title IX and MOA. The sex equity coordinator's role, even under the best of circumstances, is a difficult one. Many state and local agencies still do not accept the need for the position, nor do they recognize that a problem exists. The least a sex equity coordinator needs is the support of the leadership and the authority to implement change. Where there is support, things happen.

To a large extent, the person hired as a sex equity coordinator will dictate progress or setbacks. State agencies should pay particular attention to the qualifications and leadership skills of the individual hired to fill the sex equity coordinator position. The commitment and concern of a state for sex equity issues is expressed in the care given to filling this position as well as to the expectations and training of other state and local staff who must also help in promoting sex equity.

The subjects involved in this study expressed concern with the complacency and current attitude that "all is well", and the belief that the struggle for sex equity is over. As one person said, "There is no emotion surrounding the issue today." Some feel that many have given up. The majority expressed concern that progress has slowed and a more concerted effort is needed to keep the issue in the forefront. Each state must decide how to keep the momentum going and prepare a plan of action which will make a difference. The question is, "Whose agenda is it?" It is sad that we still have to fight to provide equity for all people.

It is difficult to predict what the future will bring. By the time this document is printed, a new Carl D. Perkins Act may be a reality. If the results of the NAVE are considered by the decision makers then the emphasis on eliminating sex discrimination in vocational education will remain a priority (see below).

> The problems associated with eliminating sex bias and sex stereotyping in vocational education and in providing full access and participation (and success) in vocational education by single parents/homemakers are larger, more complex, and more endemic than current federal resources committed to them. Furthermore, it is often federal resources -- not state and local resources -- that are even attacking the problems.

> Our survey and case study findings make clear that when districts do not receive Federal funds, they undertake few activities to promote sex equity in vocational education. Federal funds, small though they are, are supporting activities that would otherwise not be there. (51 p. 2)
>
> With so few funds available under the sex equity and single parents/homemakers set-asides, it was most disappointing to see so few vocational educators aware of the seriousness or magnitude of sex equity issues and to find such ineffective uses of funds. (51 p. 4)

Some will agree with what is stated in this document and some will not. What is reported is what was said by many individuals representing a variety of constituencies. Therefore, we should listen. The message is one of concern, but with hope. It is time to learn from our mistakes, capitalize on our successes and move on.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. American Association of University Women. (1988). Women and Vocational Education: Fact Sheet. Washington, DC: Author.

2. American Association of University Women. (1988). Women and Vocational Education: Position Paper. Washington, DC: Author.

3. American Vocational Association. (1989, January 12). The AVA position on reauthorization of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984 (Issue Paper). Alexandria, VA: Author.

4. American Vocational Association. (1981, June). A national agenda for vocational education. Arlington, VA: Author.

5. American Vocational Association. (1981, November 25). Recommended framework for the reauthorization of Vocational Education Act of 1963 - '76 Amendments (P.L. 94-482). Alexandria, VA: Author.

6. American Vocational Association. (1980). VocEd, 55(4).

7. American Vocational Association. (1979). Legislative study team on sex equity (Position Paper). Washington, DC: Author.

8. Arrindell, D. (1989, May). Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act reauthorization. Washington, DC: National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education.

9. Berryman, S.E. (1988). Routes into the mainstream: Career choices for women and minorities. Columbus, OH: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University. (Occasional Paper No. 124).

10. Berryman, S.E. (1980, June). Vocational education and the work establishment of youth: Equity and effectiveness issues. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

11. Bowers, E., & Hummel, J. (1979). Factors related to the underrepresentation of women in vocational education administration: A literature review. Columbus, OH: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University. (R & D Series No. 152).

12. Bowers, E., Quinn, K. & Hungerford,J. (1979). Women in vocational education administration: A nationwide analysis. Columbus, OH: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University. (R & D Series No. 179).

13. Briggs, N.L. (1978). Women and the skilled trades. Columbus, OH: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University. (Information Series No. 132).

14. Canora, V. (1982). Unlocking nontraditional careers: Parent awareness. Columbus, OH: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University. (R & D Series No. 215C).

15. Center for Women Policy Studies. (1988, August). CWPS in 1988. Washington, DC: Author.

16. Center for Women Policy Studies. (1987, October). The first 15 years, 1972-1987. Washington, DC: author.

17. Ciccone, J.K. & Friedenberg, J.E. (Eds.). (1988). Vocational special needs learners: Five years of research and development. Columbus: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University.

18. Citizens' Advisory Council on the Status of Women. (1976, March). Women in 1975. Washington, DC: Author.

19. Comptroller General of the United States. (1974, December). Report to the Congress: What is the role of federal assistance for vocational education? Washington, DC: General Accounting Office.

20. Council of Vocational Educators. (1983, November 14). Legislative Brief, 11(14). Alexandria, VA: American Vocational Association.

21. Dayton, C. (Ed.). (1979). Literature and secondary data review of the vocational education equity study. Volume 2. Palo Alto, CA: American Institute for Research. Authors: J. Steiger, A. Fink, J. Kosecoff, S. Martin, J. Primaverra, R.-L. Obertz, and S.H. Schlesinger.

22. DiVincenzo, M. (undated). The Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act: A picture of state implementation of the sex equity provisions. Washington, DC: Wider Opportunities for Women, Inc.

23. Division of Vocational and Technical Education. (1973). Summary data vocational education fiscal year 1972. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Bureau of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education.

24. Dunkle, M.C. (1980). A unification of forces: Coalition works for sex equity in education. VocEd, 55(4), 43-45.

25. Dunn, F. (1985). Places in the system: New directions for the vocational education of rural women. Columbus, OH: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University. (Occasional Paper No. 108).

26. Eliason, C. (1981). Entrepreneurship for women: An unfulfilled agenda. Columbus, OH: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University. (Information Series No. 221).

27. Eliason, N.C. (1977, June). It's (past) time to unstereotype! (Reprint). School Shop. Ann Arbor, Michigan.

28. Evans. N.S. (1982). Equity from a sex fairness perspective. Columbus, OH: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University. (R & D Series No. 214F).

29. Farmer, H.S. (1978). Counseling programs and services for women in nontraditional occupations. Columbus, OH: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University. (Information Series No. 133).

30. Federal Education Project. (undated). Statement on reauthorization of the vocational education act (as amended in 1976). Washington, DC: Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under the Law.

31. Goodwin, D. (1989). Postsecondary vocational education. National Assessment of Vocational Education Final Report, Volume IV. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

32. Gorman, A.M., & Vetter, L. (Eds.). (1975). Career development of women: Proceedings of 10th anniversary program. Columbus, OH: The Center for Vocational Education, The Ohio State University. (UN No. 9).

33. Grasso, J.T. & Shea, J.R. (1979, April). Effects of vocational education programs: Research findings and issues. In National Institute of Education, The planning papers for the vocational education study (pp. 101-192). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Author. (Vocational Education Study Publication No. 1).

34. Hargrave, L.A., Frazier, W.D. & Thomas, T.E. (1983). Comprehensive analysis of follow-up data for students enrolled in traditional and nontraditional vocational and technical programs. FY 1978-79, FY 1979-80, FY 1980-81. Stillwater, OK: Oklahoma State University, Department of Vocational and Technical Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 226 236).

35. Harlan, R.E. (Comp.). (1981). Fifty-one questions on the OCR guidelines. Columbus, OH: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University. (R & D Series No. 205).

36. Harmon, L.W. (1979). The guidance needs of women. Columbus, OH: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University. (Information Series NO. 149).

37. Harrison, L.R. (1980). The equity study: Results and recommendations. VocEd, 55(4), 39-42.

38. Harrison, L.R., Dahl, P.R., Shaycoft, M.F. and Parks, B.J. (1979, April). Final Report, Vol. I: Primary data of the vocational education equity study. Palo Alto, CA: American Institutes for Research.

39. Hayward, B.J. and Wirt, J.G. (August, 1989). Handicapped and disadvantaged students: Access to quality vocational education. National Assessment of Vocational Education Final Report, Volume V. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

40. Hill, A.M. and Bragg, D.D. (1985). The impact of day-care services on the education of secondary and adult students in Ohio. Columbus, OH: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University.

41. Justice, F.L. (Comp.). (1977). Resources on sex-role stereotyping in vocational education. Columbus, OH: The Center for Vocational Education, The Ohio State University.

42. Justice, F.L. (Comp.). (1979). Resource update: 1979 sex equity in vocational education. Columbus, OH: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University.

43. Kane, R.D. (1978). Preparing women to teach nontraditional vocational education. Columbus, OH: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University. (Information Series NO. 137).

44. Laitman-Ashley, N.M. (1979). Women and work: Paths to power -- A symposium. Columbus, OH: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University. (Information Series No. 190).

45. Lee, S.L., Vetter, L., Howell, K.M. and Smith, P. (1967a). Implications of women's work patterns for vocational and technical education. Columbus, OH: The Center for Vocational and Technical Education, The Ohio State University. (Research Series No. 19).

46. Lee, S.L., Vetter, L., Howell, K.M. and Smith, P. (1967b). Implications of women's work patterns for vocational and technical education: An annotated bibliography. Columbus, OH: The Center for Vocational and Technical Education, The Ohio State University. (Bibliography Series No. 1).

47. Lee, S.L., Ray, E.M., Vetter, L., Murphy, L., and Sethney, B.J. (1971). High school senior girls and the world of work: Occupational knowledge, attitudes and plans. Columbus, OH: The Center for Vocational and Technical Education, The Ohio State University. (R & D Series No. 42).

48. Loring, R.K. (1979). Women and their preparation for professional and managerial careers. Columbus, OH: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University. (Information Series No. 168).

49. Lowry, C.M., Mullen, R.E., Hooker, B.J., and Vetter, L. (1982). Recent vocational teacher education graduates' self-reported preparation to instruct exceptional students. Columbus, OH: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University.

50. Millsap, M.A. (1988). Advocates for sex equity in federal education law: The National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Harvard University.

51. Millsap, M.A. (1989, June 25). State and local response to the Carl Perkins Act: Single parent and sex equity set asides. Paper presented at the National Leadership Development Conference for Vocational Sex Equity Coordinators, Washington, DC.

52. Minnesota State Advisory Council on Vocational Education. (1987, June). Biennial report of the State Council on Vocational Technical Education. St. Paul, MN: Minnesota State Council on Vocational Technical Education.

53. Muraskin, L.D. (May, 1989). The implementation of the Carl D. Perkins Act. National Assessment of Vocational Education Final Report, Volume II. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

54. National Advisory Council on Vocational Education and National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs. (1980). Increasing sex equity: The impact of the 1976 Vocational Amendments on sex equity in vocational education. Arlington, VA: Institute for Women's Concerns.

55. National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs. (1976, 1979, 1980, 1981, 1982). Annual Report. Washington, DC: Author.

56. National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs. (1981, Fall). Title IX: The half full, half empty glass. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

57. National Assessment of Vocational Education. (1988a, January). First interim report. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

58. National Assessment of Vocational Education. (1988b, September). Second interim report. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

59. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc. (1981, April). Vocational education: Cause or cure for youth unemployment (A report to the citizens of Oakland, CA). New York, NY: H & C Custom Publishing Co., Inc.

60. National Association of State Directors of Vocational Education. (1989, May 1). The Carl D. Perkins Act: A national self-assessment. Washington, DC: Author.

61. National Association of State Directors of Vocational Education. (1989, March 7). Vocational technical education: Meeting growing needs (statement before the Education and Labor Committee, U.S. House of Representatives). Washington, DC: Author.

62. National Center for Research in Vocational Education. (1979). Equal is better: A voc ed guide to sex fairness resources and the law. Columbus, OH: Author. (VED 08)

63. National Center for Research in Vocational Education. (1978). The status of vocational education school year 1975-76. Columbus, OH: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University.

64. National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education. (1988, April). Working toward equity: A report on implementation of the sex equity provisions of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act. Washington, DC: Vocational Education Task Force, Author.

65. National Commission on Secondary Vocational Education. (1984). The unfinished agenda: The role of vocational education in the high school. Columbus, OH: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University.

66. National Institute of Education. (1981, September). The vocational education study: The final report. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Author. (Vocational Education Study Publication No. 8).

67. National Institute of Education. (1980, September). The vocational education study: The interim report. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Author. (Vocational Education Study Publication No. 3).

68. 91st Congress. (1969, September 25). Vocational Amendment of 1969. Hearings before the General Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives. 1st session on H.R. 13630. *A bill to extend expiring provisions of law relating to vocational education*. Held in Washington, DC.

69. 91st Congress, second session. (1970a, June 17, 19, 26, 29, 30). *Discrimination against women*. Hearings before the Special Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives. (Section 805 of H.R. 16098). Chair: Perkins. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

70. 91st Congress, second session. (1970b, July 1, 31). *Discrimination against women*. Hearings before the Special Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives. (Section 805 of H.R. 16098, part 2). Chair: Perkins. Washington, DC: U.S.Government Printing Office, 1971).

71. 92nd Congress. (1971, November). *Reports on the implication of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968*. General Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives. Chair: Perkins. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

72. 92nd Congress, second session. (1972, April 26-27; May 3,10). *Investigation of discrimination on the basis of sex in the Office of Education and Office of Education grant and contract procedures*. Oversight Hearings on Discrimination Against Women before ad hoc Subcommittee on Discrimination Against Women of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives. Chair: Perkins. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973.

73. 93rd Congress, first session. (1973a, July 25-26, September 12-13). *Women's Educational Equity Act*. Hearings before the Subcommittee on Equal Opportunities of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

74. 93rd Congress, first session (1973b, October 17, November 9). *Women's Educational Equity Act of 1973*. Hearings before the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Senate. (S. 2518). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

75. 93rd Congress, second session. (1974, May 6. July 31, August 1, 13, September 24). *A bill to extend the authorization of appropriations for the Vocational Education Act of 1963*. Hearings before the House General Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

76. 94th Congress, second session. (1975, March 17, April 21, 28). Sex discrimination and sex stereotyping in vocational education. Hearing before the House Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education of the Committee on Education and Labor. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

77. 94th Congress, second session. (1975, February-1976, March). Vocational and occupational education (Vols. I, II and III). House Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education of the Committee on Education and Labor. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

78. 94th Congress, second session. (1976, May). The vocational education and National Institute of Education amendments of 1976 (to accompany HR 12835, committee report 94-1085). House Committee on Education and Labor. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

79. 94th Congress, second session. (1976). Education amendments of 1976 (to accompany S. 2657, Senate Report 94-882). Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

80. 94th Congress, second session. (1976). Education amendments: Report to accompany S. 2567. Committee on Conference. (House Report No. 94-1701). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

81. 96th Congress, second session. (1980, September 17, 24, 25, 30). Current issues in vocational education. Hearings before the House Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education of the Committee on Education and Labor. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

82. 97th Congress, first session. (1981, February 24-25). Vocational education in different institutional settings. Hearings before the House Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education of the Committee on Education and Labor. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

83. 97th Congress, first session. (1981, February 26, March 3). Urban and rural vocational education. Hearings before the House Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education of the Committee on Education and Labor. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

84. 97th Congress, first session. (1981, March 13-14). Vocational education and child nutrition programs. Hearings before the House Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education of the Committee on Education and Labor. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

85. 97th Congress, first session. (1981, July 14). *Major differences between H.R. 3982 and S. 1377 for education and child nutrition*. Oversight hearing before the House Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education of the Committee on Education and Labor. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

86. 97th Congress, second session. (1982, July 1). *Vocational and Adult Education Consolidation Act*. Hearing before the Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

87. 97th Congress, second session. (1982, July 22). *Postsecondary vocational issues.* Hearings before the House Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education of the Committee on Education and Labor. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

88. 97th Congress, second session. (1982, August 3). *Occupational information*. Hearings before the House Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education of the Committee on Education and Labor. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

89. 97th Congress, second session. (1982, August 18). *Local vocational programs*. Hearings before the House Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education of the Committee on Education and Labor. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

90. 97th Congress, second session. (1982, September 23). *Older Americans vocational education act* (H.R. 6985). Hearings before the House Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education of the Committee on Education and Labor. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

91. 98th Congress, first session. (1983, February 23, 24, March 2, 3). *Oversight of vocational education, 1963*. Hearings before the Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

92. 98th Congress, first session. (1983, May 19). *To consolidate federal vocational and adult education programs*. Hearing before the Senate Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

93. 98th Congress, first session. (1983, October 12, 13). *Oversight hearings on elementary, secondary and vocational education*. Hearings before the Senate Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

94. 98th Congress, first session. (1983, October 18). Oversight of vocational education, 1983. Hearing before the Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

95. 98th Congress, first session. (1983, November 1-3, 9). Vocational Technical Education Act of 1983 (I) Hearings before the Senate Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

96. 98th Congress, second session. (1984, February 7, 9). Vocational Technical Education Act of 1983 (II). Hearings before the Senate Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

97. 98th Congress, second session. (1984, October 2). Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act. Conference report on H.R. 4164. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

98. Pautler, A.J., Jr. (1977). The future of vocational education. Washington, DC: The National Advisory Council on Vocational Education.

99. Peterson, M., and Vetter, L. (1977). Sex fairness in career education. Columbus, OH: The Center for Vocational Education, The Ohio State University. (Information Series No. 109).

100. President's Task Force on Women's Rights and Responsibilities. (1970, April). A matter of simple justice. Washington, DC: Author.

101. Project on Equal Educational Rights. (1986). The 1986 PEER report card: A state-by-state survey of the status of women and girls in America's schools. (Policy Paper No. 5). Washington, DC: Author.

102. Radcliffe, C.W. (1985). "The Hill and AVA." VocEd, 60(4), 26-28.

103. Resource Center on Sex Equity. (1982). Policies for the future: State policies, regulations and resources related to the achievement of educational equity for females and males. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.

104. Rieder, C.H. (1977). Women, work, and vocational education. Columbus, OH: The Center for Vocational Education, The Ohio State University. (Occasional Paper No. 26).

105. Ross, N. (1980). Directory of women administrators in vocational education. Columbus, OH: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University. (R & D Series No. 201).

106. Ruff, R., Shylo, B., and Russell, J.F. (1981, January). Vocational education: A look into the future. Columbus, OH: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University.

107. Schenck, J.P. (1977). Sex fairness in vocational education. Columbus, OH: The Center for Vocational Education, The Ohio State University. (Information Series No. 120).

108. Schroeder, P.E. (Comp.). (1973). Women in the world of work: A bibliography of ERIC documents. Columbus, OH: The Center for Vocational and Technical Education, The Ohio State University. (Bibliography Series No. 19).

109. Sechler, J. (1982a). Unlocking nontraditional careers: Communication skills. Columbus, OH: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University. (R & D Series No. 215A).

110. Sechler, J. (1982b). Unlocking nontraditional careers: Enhancing placement. Columbus, OH: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University. (R & D Series No. 215B).

111. Smith, P.A. (1982). The labor force behavior of sex nontraditional vocational students: A follow-up assessment of training for nontraditional occupations. Stillwater, OK: Oklahoma State University, College of Business Administration, Office of Business and Economics Research.

112. Spain, R.K. (1982). Unlocking nontraditional careers: Recruitment skills. Columbus, OH: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University. (R & D Series No. 215D).

113. Stakelon, A.E., & Magisos, J.H. (Comps.). (1975). Sex stereotyping and occupational aspiration: An annotated bibliography. Columbus, OH: The Center for Vocational Education, The Ohio State University. (Bibliography Series No. 29).

114. Steele, M. (1974). Women in vocational education. Flagstaff, AZ: Project Baseline, Northern Arizona University.

115. Steiger, J.M. & Cooper, S. (1975). Vocational preparation of women (A report of the Secretary's Advisory Committee on the Rights and Responsibilities of Women). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

116. Steiger, J.M. & Schlesinger, S.H. (1979). Fostering sex fairness in vocational education: Strategies for administrators. Columbus, OH: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University. (Information Series No. 147).

117. Taylor, C. (1986). Entrepreneurship for women: Escape from the pink collar ghetto. Columbus, OH: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University. (Occasional Paper No. 121).

118. Tetreault, M.K. & Schmuck, P. (1985). Equity, educational reform and gender. Issues in Education, 3(1), 45-67.

119. Thompson, M. & Bitters, B. (1985). Sex equity and the Carl Perkins Act. VocEd, 60(4), 38-39.

120. U.S. Congress. (1976, September). Education amendments (House Conference Report 94-1701). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

121. U.S. Congress. (1975, November 3). Women's Vocational Amendments of 1975. Congressional Record, Senate. Vol. 121, Part 27, 94th Congress, first session.

122. U.S. Congress. (1976, May 10). Second Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1976: Amendments to restore funds for National Commission of International Women's Year. Congressional Record, Senate. Vol. 122, Part II, 94th Congress, second session.

123. U.S. Congress. (1976, May 11). Vocational Education and National Institute of Education Amendments of 1976. Congressional Record, House. Vol. 122, Part II, 94th Congress, second session.

124. U.S. Congress. (1984, October 2). The Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984 as reported out of House-Senate Conference Committee. Congressional Record, House.

125. U.S. Department of Education. (1985, August 16). Sex equity provisions of Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984 (P.L. 98-524) as indicated in the Act and in the Final Regulations for the Act. Federal Register. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

126. U.S. Department of Education. (1985, January 25, Friday). State vocational education program and secondary's discretionary programs of vocational education: Proposed rules. Federal Register (Vol. 50, No. 17). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

127. U.S. Department of Education. (1984, June 4). Unpublished data, Tables 1206 and 1221. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, Vocational Education Data System.

128. U.S. Office of Education. (1977, October 3, Monday). DHEW vocational education, state programs, and commissioner's discretionary programs: Final regulations. Federal Register (Part IV). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

129. Verheyden-Hilliard, M.E. (undated). *A handbook for workshops on sex equity in education*. Washington, DC: American Personnel and Guidance Association.

130. Verheyden-Hilliard, M.E. (1977). *Cracking the glass slipper? PEER guide to ending sex bias in your schools*. Washington, DC: NOW Legal Defense and Education Fund.

131. Verheyden-Hilliard, M.E. (1979). *Professional development programs for sex equity in vocational education*. Columbus, OH: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University. (Information Series No. 148).

132. Vetter, L. (1988). Encouraging nontraditional options. In J.K. Ciccione and J.E. Friedenberg (Eds.), *Vocational special needs learners: Five years of research and development* (pp. 145-186). Columbus, OH: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University.

133. Vetter, L. (1988). Single parents and homemakers. In J.K. Ciccone and J.E. Friedenberg (Eds.), *Vocational special needs learners: Five years of research and development* (pp. 187-216). Columbus, OH: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University.

134. Vetter, L., Brown, A.J. & Sethney, B.J. (1975). *Women in the work force: Follow-up study of curriculum materials*. Columbus, OH: The Center for Vocational and Technical Education, The Ohio State University. (R & D Series No. 102).

135. Vetter, L., Burkhardt, C. & Sechler, J. (1978a). *A guide for vocational education sex equity personnel*. Columbus, OH: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University. (R & D Series No. 143).

136. Vetter, L., Burkhardt, C. & Sechler, J. (1978b, 2nd ed., 1980). *Vocational education sex equity strategies*. Columbus, OH: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University. (R & D Series No. 144).

137. Vetter, L., Lowry, C.M. & Burkhardt, C. (1977). *Sugar and spice is not the answer: A parent handbook on the career implications of sex stereotyping*. Columbus, OH: The Center for Vocational Education, The Ohio State University. (R & D Series No. 129).

138. Vetter, L. & Rickey, M.L. (1985). *Update: A guide for vocational education sex equity personnel*. Columbus, OH: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University.

139. Vetter, L., Sechler, J., Lowry, C.M. & Canora, V. (1979). Factors influencing nontraditional vocational education enrollments: A literature review. Columbus, OH: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University. (R & D Series No. 150).

140. Vetter, L. & Sethney, B.J. (1971). Planning ahead for the world of work. Columbus, OH: The Center for Vocational and Technical Education, The Ohio State University. (Materials Package for R & D Series No. 81) (Revised edition, 1975).

141. Vetter, L. & Sethney, B.J. (1972). Women in the work force: Development and field testing of curriculum materials. Columbus, OH: The Center for Vocational and Technical Education, The Ohio State University. (R & D Series No. 81).

142. Vetter, L., Spain, R.K. & Kelly, M.E. (1981). Building Your Own Scenario: (Service Area), Sex Equity, and Alternative Futures. Columbus, OH: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University. (Series of eight training manuals for Agriculture, Business and Office Occupations, Health Occupations, Home Economics, Industrial Arts, Marketing and Distributive Education, Technical Education and Trade and Industry Vocational Education Service Areas.)

143. Vetter, L. & Stockburger, D.W. (1974). Career patterns of a national sample of women. Columbus, OH: The Center for Vocational Education, The Ohio State University. (Re-Issue, 1977). (R & D Series No. 95).

144. Vetter, L., Stockburger, D.W. & Brose, C. (1974). Career guidance materials: Implications for women's career development. Columbus, OH: The Center for Vocational Education, The Ohio State University. (R & D Series No. 97).

145. Vetter, L., Winkfield, P.W., Lowry, C.M. & Ransom, R.M. (1977). Career planning programs for women employees: National survey. Columbus, OH: The Center for Vocational Education, The Ohio State University. (R & D Series No. 135).

146. Vetter, L., Winkfield, P.W., Ransom, R.M. & Lowry, C.M. (1977). Career planning programs for women employees: Prototype programs. Columbus, OH: The Center for Vocational Education, The Ohio State University. (R & D Series No. 137).

147. Vetter, L., Winkfield, P.W., Spain, R.K. & Kelly, M.E. (1982). Equity and vocational education: An initial synthesis of progress and recommendations for the future. Columbus, OH: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University.

148. Vocational Education Equity Council and State Sex Equity Coordinators. (October, 1981). Sex equity in vocational education: A policy paper for reauthorization. Washington, DC: Author.

149. Wider Opportunities for Women, Inc. (1988, November). Equity in the Midwest: A report on the implementation of sex equity in vocational education in Illinois, Indiana and Wisconsin. Washington, DC: Author.

150. Winkfield, P.W., Lowry, C.M. & Vetter, L. (1977a). Career planning programs for women employees: Annotated bibliography. Columbus, OH: The Center for Vocational Education, The Ohio State University. (R & D Series No. 136).

151. Winkfield, P.W., Lowry, C.M. & Vetter, L. (1977b). Career planning programs for women employees: Review of the literature. Columbus, OH: The Center for Vocational Education, The Ohio State University. (R & D Series No. 134).

152. Wirt, J.G., Muraskin, L.D., Goodwin, D.A. & Meyer, R.H. (July, 1989). Summary of findings and recommendations. National Assessment of Vocational Education Final Report, Volume I. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

153. Women on Words and Images. (1978). Guidelines for sex-fair vocational education materials. Columbus, OH: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University. (SN 22).

APPENDICES

Page

A Chronology of Events 162
B State Personnel Responsible for Sex Equity in Vocational Education (Through 1989) 172
C Sex Equity Coordinators, Current and Past, Participating in National Survey 175
D Study Participants 179
E Federal Personnel 1973 to 1988 182

F Objectives of the Project 185
G Vocational Education Sex Equity Legislation Study; Questionnaire Part I 186
H Vocational Education Sex Equity Legislation Study: Questionnaire Part II 192
I Resources Produced by State Sex Equity Programs 196

J Title IX Regulations 212
K Vocational Amendments of 1976 - Excerpts from the Law 214
L Carl D. Perkins Act of 1984 - Excerpts from the Law 226

M Average Enrollment in Vocational Subjects by Sex 234
N Distribution of High School Graduates Entering Postsecondary Vocational Education in Public Two-Year Colleges, Technical Institutes, and Private Vocational Schools, Classes of 1972 and 1980 235
O Executive Summary: Report by NACVE and NACWEP 236
P Facts on United States Working Women 242

Q Position Papers on the Reauthorization of Carl D. Perkins Act of 1984 by: 245
  Q1 American Association of University Women
  Q2 Wider Opportunities for Women
  Q3 Vocational Education Equity Council
R Selected Reports and Studies in Vocational Education Impacting Sex Equity 252
S Recent Papers and Publications Impacting the Reauthorization of the Carl D. Perkins Act of 1984 280

APPENDIX A

CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS

1972

July 1: Passage of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 prohibiting discrimination on the basis of sex in any education program receiving Federal financial assistance.

1973

Summary vocational education data for FY 1972 published by the Division of Vocational and Technical Education, U.S. Office of Education (USOE), Department of Health, Education and Welfare (DHEW), documenting sex segregation of students in vocational education programs and of vocational teachers.

Publication by Pennsylvania Department of Education of Training the Woman to Know Her Place: The Social Antecedents of Women in the World of Work by Sandra L. and Daryl Bem.

Hearings on Women's Educational Equity Act (WEEA), the first national equity forum where evidence of sex discrimination in vocational education was presented.

December: Publication by the Women's Bureau, U.S. Department of Labor, of Issues in Vocational Training for Women and Girls, a leaflet that stressed important points regarding sex equity.

1974

Passage of WEEA, a first small step toward action intervention in educational programs.

Initiation of North Carolina's New Pioneers in Vocational Education project, Amanda Smith, Project Director.

Wider Opportunities for Women (WOW) published the first national magazine for working women (WOW was established in 1965 as Washington Opportunities for Women to provide non-traditional training for women.

Project Baseline, Northern Arizona University, published supplemental report, Women in Vocational Education, by Marilyn Steele of the Mott Foundation.

The Federal Education Project of the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under the Law established, funded by the Ford Foundation with Norman Chaiken, Cynthia Brown and Janet Wells on staff.

Project on Equal Education Rights (PEER) established by the National Organization for Women (NOW), Legal Defense and Education Fund, funded by the Ford Foundation, with Holly Knox as Project Director.

Women's Educational Equity Communications Network established at Far West Regional Laboratory for Educational Research and Development with Matilda Butler as Director.

Resource Center on Sex Roles in Education was established at the National Foundation for the Improvement of Education, National Education Association, with Shirley McCune as Director.

U.S. House hearings on vocational education provided important information on the need for eliminating sex stereotyping in vocational education (p. 174).

October: HR 17304, introduced on October 11 by Representative Carl D. Perkins and others contained the first reference to equality of sex in any major vocational education bill -- stated that State and National Advisory Councils should include representatives from both sexes (p. 175).

December: Vocational Preparation for Women: A Critical Analysis, by JoAnn M. Steiger, prepared for the Illinois State Board of Education, was published.

A Government Accounting Office (GAO) report, "What is the Role of Federal Assistance for Vocational Education?" specified that sex was a barrier restricting access to training and employment and recommended that DHEW assist in eliminating barriers (p. 175).

1974-75

Considerable activities by advocacy groups.

GAO study on vocational education in seven states (California, Kentucky, Minnesota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Texas and Washington) provided a negative report that received considerable publicity.

1975

Citizen's Advisory Council on the Status of Women's report, Women in 1975, recommended immediate action by the Federal administration and legislation to correct inequities.

Arvonne Fraser, President of the Women's Equity Action League (WEAL), and one of the first to focus on vocational education testified before the U.S. House on the need for vocational training for females.

Ellen Hoffman, aide to Senator Walter Mondale on women's issues, asked women's groups to prepare amendments to the Vocational Education Act to include specific sex equity provisions (p. 178-179).

Senate hearings on the Review of Vocational Education Programs (p. 176-177).

Debra Ashford, from the University of Alabama, appointed Special Assistant to Dr. William Pierce, Deputy Commissioner, USOE, DHEW.

March-April: Special hearings on sex discrimination and sex stereotyping in vocational education, initiated by Representative Shirley Chisholm and Patsy Mink, were held by the House Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education on March 17, April 21 and 28 (p. 178-179) -- Shirley Downs was aide to Representative Chisholm.

Spring: The National Institute of Education (NIE) published Issues of Sex Bias and Sex Fairness in Career Interest Measurement, edited by Esther E. Diamond, that included guidelines for developing, selecting, and using interest inventories.

June 4: Title IX Regulations issued, in Federal Register, by U.S. Office of Education, DHEW.

June 17-26: The Subcommittee on Post-Secondary Education of the Committee of Education and Labor, U.S. Senate, detailed stereotyping in vocational education at hearings.

August: The Minnesota State Advisory Council for Vocational Education published, A Reexamination of the Elimination of Bias in Minnesota's Area Vocational-Technical Institutes.

Fall: Senate approved creation of a 17-member National Advisory Council on Women's Education Programs (NACWEP) through WEEA to advise the Secretary of DHEW and others in sex equity in education -- Joy Simonson became first Executive Director and Bernice Sandler first Chair of NACWEP.

September: Specific recommendations for changing legislation presented by Steiger at U.S. House hearings on Vocational and Occupational Education (p. 176-177).

November: A "Women in Vocational Education" bill was introduced by Senator Walter Mondale on November 3 (p. 178-179).

The Report and Recommendations of the Secretary's Advisory Committee on the Rights and Responsibilities of Women, entitled The Vocational Preparation of Women and written by JoAnn M. Steiger and Sara Cooper was presented to the Secretary of DHEW -- the report reviewed historical background on education for women and underlying problems in vocational education and recommended that the vocational education bill be amended to address the problems (p. 180).

1976

Project EVE (Equal Vocational Education) undertaken by Jane Lerner, Fredell Bergstrom and Joseph E. Champagne for the Houston public schools and the University of Houston.

Study of sex bias and sex discrimination in vocational education in Nebraska, by Marge Harouff, was published by the Nebraska State Department of Education.

Final report issued by the House Committee on Education and Labor concluded that: (a) the inferior position of women in the labor market was being reinforced by current practices in vocational education, and (b) Federal legislation had to address the problem if it was to be solved.

February: Senate Education Subcommittee adopted Mondale's Amendments to end sex bias in job-oriented education programs.

February 27: Letter from Margaret Dunkle, as Chair of the National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education, was sent to Senator Williams, Chair of the Labor and Public _____ Committee, urging support of Senate Bill 203, the Women's Vocational Education Amendment, 1975 (p. 180).

March: Specific recommendations for changing legislation presented by Steiger at House hearings on vocational and occupational education (p. 176-177).

March 18: HR 12616, Women in Vocational Education, was introduced by Representative Bella Abzug (p. 181).

March 29: HR 12835, introduced by Representative Carl D. Perkins, contained many provisions suggested by women advocates.

April: House Education and Labor Committee turns attention to the reauthorization of the Vocational Education Act.

Cynthia Brown becomes Chair of the National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education and works with Shirley Downs, aide to Representative Shirley Chisholm and Jack Jennings, Chief Counsel for House Committee.

May 10: Representative Matsunaga asked for consideration of a bill that proposed amendments to the Vocational Education Act that would eliminate sex biases homemaking education and emphasize consumer education and family resource management.

May 11: House adopted, by voice vote, the Chisholm-Blouin Amendment to HR 12835 -- HR 12835 was passed with a 390-3 vote.

May 13: Senate Committee Report 94-882 was ordered to be printed -- contained many of the same provisions as the House bill, with the major differences being the House bill contained references to homemakers, single heads of households, and women in traditionally female jobs and the Senate bill authorizing monies for special projects.

August 15: The U.S. Senate began consideration of Education Amendments. Although no one spoke for or against the sex equity provisions specifically, a statement on the importance of provisions to overcome sex discrimination by Stanley J. McFarland, National Education Association, was read into the Congressional Record.

August 27: Senate bill passed (p. 183-187).

August: House and Senate versions of vocational education amendments go to Conference Committee.

October 12: Title II (Vocational Education) of the Education Amendments of 1976 (P.L. 94-482) signed by President Ford, included provisions for full-time personnel to overcome sex bias, sex stereotyping, and sex discrimination (sex equity coordinators), displaced homemakers programming, and sex-aside $50,000 per state, becoming the first major breakthrough in eliminating sex discrimination in vocational education.

November: Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education (BOAE), USOE, released "Notice of Intent to Propose Rulemaking" for P.L. 94-482.

1977

Curriculum materials, "Expanding Career Horizons", developed by JoAnn M. Steiger and Arlene Fink, were published by the Illinois State Board of Education.

Cracking the Glass Sliper? PEER's Guide to Ending Sex Bias in Your Schools, by Mary Ellen Verhayden-Hilliard, was published by the NOW Legal Defense and Education Fund.

Hearings on regulations for Title II were developed under leadership of Daniel B. Dunham, Deputy Commissioner, BOAE, with the assistance of Michael Brustein and Gail Minor Smith.

April 7: Proposed regulations for Title II, P.L. 94-482, were published with a 30-day comment period.

Deputy Commissioner William Pierce developed a different approach to rule making and involved the public in hearings. A task force within the Office of Education was appointed to draft regulations, including for the first time, high-grade personnel, with Juliette V. Lester as Chair, Dick Carlson, Sheryl McMillian, and attorneys Michael Brustein and Paul Whitman.

May: Equal Rights for Women in Education Project, Education Commission of the States, published a model policy statement and guidelines for implementation of sex equity in vocational education.

June 20-24: Sex Equity Workshop, "Expanding Nontraditional Opportunities in Vocational Education," developed by Ellis Associates (Mary Ellis), held in St. Louis.

June 21: Vocational Education Equity Council (VEEC) was formed at St. Louis workshop, with the following officers elected: President: Fern Green, Oklahoma; Vice-President: John W. Havery, Oregon; Secretary-Treasurer: Linda Wilson, Oklahoma.

Fall: Certification of names of all sex equity coordinators was received by USOE -- two men, all others women.

September: How To Erase Sex Discrimination in Vocational Education was published by the Women's Rights Project of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) Foundation.

October 3: Final Regulations for P.L. 94-482 were published in the Federal Register.

December 2-4: At the AVA Convention, Atlantic City, the request by VEEC to be admitted to sectional status in the New and Related Services Division was denied. The same VEEC officers were continued for 1978.

1978

Sheryl Denbo appointed Special Advisor on Women's Issues, BOAE, USOE, DHEW.

Guidelines for Sex Fair Vocational Education Materials, developed by Women on Words and Images, was published by BOAE, USOE.

February: Ellis Associates workshop in Orlando for 15 states (one state from each region plus five other states) -- the sex equity coordinator plus two other State Department of Vocational Education staff members developed action plans for sex equity.

April-May: Regional conferences for sex equity coordinators held in Boston, Nashville, Milwaukee, Denver and San Francisco (NIE-sponsored project at the National Center for Research in Vocational Education -- NCRVE -- at Ohio State University; Louise Vetter, Project Director; Shirley McCune and Martha Matthews, Conference Facilitators; Roslyn D. Kane, Third Party Evaluator). A Guide for State Sex Equity Personnel and Vocational Education Sex Equity Strategies were published by NCRVE as part of the project.

October: Education Professionals Development Act (EPDA) Region V Sex Equity Coordinators' Professional Development Workshop held in Minneapolis, organized by Donna Boben, Minnesota Sex Equity Coordinator.

November: First National Conference for Sex Equity Coordinators, sponsored by BOAE, USOE, was held at Coolfant, West Virginia. The contract for the project was held by Rj Associates (Roslyn Kane, Jill Miller) and the Project Officer was Sheryl Denbo.

December: Office for Civil Rights (OCR) proposed guidelines for elimination of discrimination and denial of services in vocational education, based on sex, race or handicap -- Charlotte Carney (Gore) chaired VEEC's ad hoc committee to prepare comments (Adams' Order -- 1972 Court Case: Adams vs. L. Richards).

VEEC officers elected for 1979 and announced at AVA Convention in Dallas were as follows: President: Linda Beene, Arkansas; Vice-President: Millie Huff, Tennessee; Secretary-Treasurer: Ella Stotz, South Dakota.

Task Force was established in DHEW to develop guidelines to deal with Title IX (sex discrimination), Title IV (race discrimination, and Title V (handicap discrimination) problems in vocational education.

1978-79

Michael Brustein became Branch Chief, Office of General Counsel of Vocational Education. More attorneys were hired to answer the many questions precipitated by the legislation.

1979

Barbara Bitters, Wisconsin Sex Equity Coordinator, appointed Special Advisor on Women's Issues, BOAE, for 1979-80.

Displaced Homemakers Network, Inc., founded (funded by Women's Bureau, U.S. Department of Labor).

March 21: OCR Guidelines were issued, requiring states to develop Methods of Administration (MOA) -- sex equity coordinators were not supposed to do this, yet in many states were given the responsibility.

March 28: Linda Beene, VEEC President, testified before the Senate Appropriations Committee regarding increased funding for programs to encourage non-traditional choices.

October 21-22: VEEC Legislative Study Team on Sex Equity met in Washington, DC. Members of the team were: Linda Beene, SEC, Arkansas (Leader); Anna Biermeir, SEC for Postsecondary, Wisconsin; Barbara Bitters, BOAE, USOE; R. Kent Boesdorfer, Sex Equity Consultant; Ralph Bregman, National Advisory Council for Vocational Education (NACVE); Mary Ellis, Consultant; Roslyn D. Kane, Consultant; Carl F. Lamar, Teacher Educator, University of Kentucky; Marie Mayor, SEC, Maryland; Phyllis McClure, NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund; Jim Reid, NASDVE (State Directors); Joy Simonson, NACWEP; Mary Ellen Verhayden-Hilliard, Consultant; Jacqueline Walker, SEC, New Jersey; Janet Wells, Federal Education Project; and Eunice Wright-Jones, SEC, District of Columbia.

October 31: Title IX Technical Assistance Project Conference, Vail, Colorado -- VEEC legislative sessions.

November 30-December 4: AVA Convention at Anaheim saw VEEC accepted as a section in the Administration Division. Officers elected for 1980 were as follows: President: Linda Beene, Arkansas; Vice-President: Ella Stotz, South Dakota; Secretary-Treasurer: Nancy Evans, Ohio.

December 31: Draft of VEEC sex equity position paper, by Anna Biermeir, submitted to AVA and included in Vocational Education Legislative Study disseminated to AVA study team leaders at January 7-9, 1980 meeting.

1980

Marie Mayor appointed Special Advisor on Women's Issues, BOAE, USOE, for 1980-81.

Conference for Black Sex Equity Coordinators organized by Phyllis McClure, NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund Vocational Education Project.

May 1-4: First National Leadership Development Conference for Vocational Sex Equity Coordinators was held in Lanham, Maryland, as Maryland had ratified the Equal Rights Amendment. Barbara Bitters and Marie Mayor organized the conference. No federal funds were provided for the conference. The Leadership Conference has continued as a yearly event.

May 8-9: Hearings in New York City, sponsored by NACVE and NACWEP, on the impact of the Education Amendments of 1976 on Sex Equity in Vocational Education.

May 15-16: Hearings in Denver for NACVE-NACWEP Project.

July: Publication of The Unfulfilled Promise of Vocational Education: A Look at Sex and Race Equity in Georgia, by Ginney Looney, a report of the Vocational Education Monitoring Project, ACLU Foundation of Georgia.

December: NACVE-NACWEP report, Increasing Sex Equity: The Impact of the 1976 Vocational Education Amendments on Sex Equity in Vocational Education, published.

December 5-9: VEEC Officers for 1981, announced at the AVA Convention in New Orleans, were as follows: President: Ella Stotz, South Dakota; Vice President: Nancy Evans, Ohio; Secretary-Treasurer: Cecil Wright, Texas.

1981

April 8-10: National Conference for Sex Equity Coordinators and State Directors of Vocational Education at NCRVE (part of Office of Vocational and Adult Education, OVAE, contract with Far West Lab, Matilda Butler, Project Director). Only five state directors attended.

August-October: Regional Sex Equity Conferences (part of Far West Lab contract) -- August 27-28: San Francisco; October 1-2: Nashville; October 15-16: Madison; October 29-30: Washington, DC.

September: Education Amendments of 1976 reauthorized and extended to 1983, later extended to 1984.

October 21: Hearings on NIE Vocational Education Study mandated by the Educational Amendments of 1976 -- Henry David said that the major recommendation was that vocational education provide opportunities for those who lack them.

December: VEEC Officers for 1982, announced at AVA Convention in Atlanta, were as follows: President: Nancy Evans, Ohio; Vice President: Beverly Postelwaite, Washington; Secretary-Treasurer: Joy Dee Joseph, Louisiana.

December 16-17: House of Representatives Hearings on Vocational Education reauthorization -- testimony by Nancy Evans, Carol Jabonaski (New York) and Connie Gipson (California) using VEEC position paper.

1982

League of Women Voters (LWV) Education Fund published Achieving Sex Equity in Vocational Education: A Crack in the Wall, by Ruth Sherman.

Vocational Education Hearings -- Testimony from the Vocational Education Task Force of the Coalition for Women and Girls in Education by Cinday Marano (WOW), Theresa Cusick and Mary Shannon (PEER).

May 12-14: Sex Equity Coordinators' Leadership Development Conference, Washington, DC.

July: Hotline Special Edition reporting a VEEC special project -- the review and interpretation of data collected for the Educational Testing Service (ETS) report on Career Information Systems in Secondary Schools for implications for sex-fair counseling by Ella Stotz, Nancy Evans, Loydia Webber (Georgia), Barbara Hales (Utah), Martha Fair, and Cecil Wright.

December 3-7: VEEC Officers for 1983; announced at the AVA Convention in St. Louis, were as follows: President: Beverly Postelwaite; Vice-President: Loydia Webber, Georgia; Secretary-Treasurer: Ann Turnham-Smith, Alabama.

1983

Spring: Sex Equity Coordinators' Leadership Development Conference, Washington, DC.

November 1: U.S. House Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education, Committee on Education and Labor Hearings -- Linda Tarr-Whelan of NEA testified on the need for more funds for sex equity in vocational education.

November 3: House hearing testimony from Theresa Cusick for the Coalition and Janet Wells for the Federal Education Project -- noted the increasing economic need of women and that women were still in low paying jobs.

November 9: House hearing testimony from Marie Mayor, representing VEEC, based on VEEC report, "Sex Equity in Vocational Education, 1981-83: Summary of Activities by State", coordinated and developed by Beverly Postlewaite.

December: VEEC Officers for 1984, announced at the AVA Convention were as follows: President: Loydia Webber, Georgia; Vice President: Marie Mayor, Maryland; Secretary-Treasurer: Mary Thompson, Wisconsin.

1984

March: U.S. House of Representatives votes 373 to 4 on a new vocational education act, with 5% of the basic grant to go to eliminate sex discrimination in vocational education.

May 2-4: Sex Equity Coordinators' Leadership Development Conference, Washington, DC.

June 7: New vocational education bill voted out of Senate committee.

August 3: The untimely death of Carl D. Perkins, Chair, House Education and Labor Committee.

August 8: Senate bill passed, with 11.5 set-aside for single working parents, adult homemakers, and sex equity.

October 19: Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act passed, continuing the sex equity coordinator position with $60,000 and including sex-asides for sex equity programming (3.5% of basic grant) and single parents and homemakers (8.5%).

November 30-December 4: VEEC Officers elected for 1985, announced at the AVA Convention in New Orleans, were as follows: President: Mary Mayor, Maryland; Vice President: Mary Ann Etu, New York; Secretary-Treasurer: Jane Adair, Illinois.

1985

Joan Siebert Dalton, selected as Equity Education Program Specialist, OVAE, for 1985-86, but stayed in position only a few months.

Spring: Sex Equity Coordinators' Leadership Development Conference, Washington, DC.

August 16: Final Regulations for the Perkins Act published in the Federal Register.

September 18-19: National Conference for Sex Equity Coordinators held at NCRVE, Columbus, Ohio (OVAE-sponsored project), resulting in, Update: A Guide for State Vocational Education Sex Equity Personnel.

December 6-10: VEEC Officers elected for 1986, announced at the AVA Convention in Atlanta, were as follows: President: Mary Ann Etu, New York; Vice President: Jane Adair, Illinois; Secretary-Treasurer: Elizabeth Stambolian, New Jersey.

1986

Spring: Sex Equity Coordinators' Leadership Development Conference, Washington, DC.

December 5-9: VEEC Officers elected for 1987, announced at the AVA Convention in Dallas, were as follows: President: Jane Adair, Illinois; Vice-President: Ann T. Smith, Alabama; Secretary-Treasurer: Elizabeth Stambolian, New Jersey.

1987

Jane Adair, selected as Equity Education Program Specialist, OVAE for 1987-88, but stayed in position only a few months.

Project initiated to document the history of vocational education sex equity legislation was funded by the Delaware Division of Vocational Education, Carol Mayhew, Sex Equity Coordinator, with Lila C. Murphy as Project Director and Louise Vetter as Project Consultant.

Spring: Sex Equity Coordinators' Leadership Development Conference, Washington, DC.

June: 10th Anniversary of the founding of VEEC.

December 4-8: 10th Anniversary of VEEC celebrated at AVA Convention in Las Vegas. Officers elected for 1988 were as follows: President: Ann T. Smith, Alabama; Vice President: Lou Ann Hargrave, Oklahoma; Secretary-Treasurer: Harriet Gleason, Washington.

1988

January: First Interim Report of the National Assessment of Vocational Education issued.

April: Publication of *Working Toward Equity: A Report on Implementation of the Sex Equity Provisions of the Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act* by the National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education, Vocational Education Task Force.

May 1-4: Sex Equity Coordinators' Leadership Development Conference, Washington, DC.

September: Second Interim Report of the National Assessment of Vocational Education issued.

Fall: Publication of *Equity in the Midwest: A Report on the Implementation of Sex Equity in Vocational Education in Illinois, Indiana and Wisconsin* by Wider Opportunities for Women.

December 1-5: VEEC Officers elected for 1989, announced at the AVA Convention in St. Louis, were as follows: President: Lou Ann Hargrave, Oklahoma; Vice President: Harriet Gleason, Washington, Secretary-Treasurer: Georganna Beachboard, Missouri.

1989

Volume 4 of the Final Report of the National Assessment of Vocational Education, *Postsecondary Vocational Education*, by David Goodwin, issued.

March: VEEC position paper on the reauthorization of the Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act issued, calling for reauthorization of the act with the vocational sex equity requirements and set-aside provisions unchanged.

March 27: Letter of support for the retention and refinement of the sex equity provisions of the Perkins Act sent to Representative Hawkins, Chair of the House Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education by: American Association of University Women; Black Women's Agenda; Church Women United; Displaced Homemakers Network; Federally Employed Women; Mexican-American Women's National Association; National Association for Commissions on Women; National Institute for Women of Color; National Women's Conference Committee; National Women's Law Center; National Women's Political Caucus; National Women's Studies Association; Organization of Pan-Asian Women; Project on Equal Educational Rights of the NOW Legal Defense and Education Fund; Wider Opportunites for Women; Women's Equity Action League; Women's Legal Defense Fund; YWCA of the USA, National Board.

May 1: National Association of State Directors of Vocational Education's report, The Carl D. Perkins Act: A National Self Assessment, issued, citing many successful single parent/homemakers and sex equity programs.

May: Volume 2 of the Final Report of the National Assessment of Vocational Education, The Implementation of the Carl D. Perkins Act, by Lana D. Muraskin, issued.

Highlights of H.R. 7, the "Applied Technology Education Amendments of 1989", the House' version of the Perkins Act reauthorization, prepared by the Vocational Education Task Force of the National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education.

June 23-29: Sex Equity Coordinators' Leadership Development Conference, Washington, DC.

July: Volume 1 of the Final Report of the National Assessment of Vocational Education, Summary of Findings and Recommendations by John G. Wirt, Lana D. Muraskin, David A. Goodwin, and Robert H. Meyer, issued.

August: Volume 5 of the Final Report of the National Assessment of Vocational Education, Handicapped and Disadvantaged Students: Access to Quality Vocational Education, by Becky Jon Hayward and John G. Wirt, issued.

November 30-December 4: VEEC Officers elected for 1990, announced at the AVA Convention in Orlando, were as follows: President: Harriet Gleason, Washington; Vice President: Connie Gipson, California; Secretary-Treasurer: Georganna Beachboard, Missouri.

1990

April 29-May 2: National Leadership Development Conference of the Sex Equity Coordinators, Washington, DC.

APPENDIX B

STATE PERSONNEL RESPONSIBLE FOR SEX EQUITY IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION (through 1989)

ALABAMA
Voc.Ed. Equity Specialist
  Mae Willa Mason
  Ann Turnham Smith

ALASKA
Sex Equity Coordinator
  Naomi Stockdale
  Linda Van Ballenbergh
  Harvey Cromett
  Roy Henderson

ARIZONA
Specialist, Equal Voc. Oppor.
  Jenny Erwin
  Debbie Dillon

ARKANSAS
Supervisor, Sex Equity Prog.
  Edith Ehrmann
  Janice Gresham
  Linda Beene

CALIFORNIA
Consultant
  Connie Gipson

COLORADO
Sex Equity Specialist
  Carol Vote
  Dorothy Lawrence
  Patricia Goggins

CONNECTICUT
Voc. Equity Consultant
  Diana Woolis
  Carol Aiken Chapin

DELAWARE
Coord., Sex Equity Prog.
  Sarah L. Bell
  Carol O'Neill Mayhew

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
Sex Equity Coordinator
  Eunice Wright-Jones

FLORIDA
Voc. Ed. Equity Admin.
  Charlotte Carney Gore

GEORGIA
Coord., Voc. Equity
  Audrey Reid
  Ann Lary
  Loydia Webber

HAWAII
Coord. of Special Services
  Barbara Tavares
  Berlyn Nishamura
  Barbara White

IDAHO
Voc. Ed. Equity Coordinator
  Shirley Silver
  Diane Martin
  Lianne McAllister

ILLINOIS
Sex Equity Supervisor
  Joe Turek
  Jane Adair
  Connie Cline

INDIANA
State Coord. for Equity
  Jennifer Biddle
  Wendy Helton
  Nancy Moeller
  Cecilia Hawkins

IOWA
Sex Equity Coordinator
  Mary Wiberg
  Beverly Gillette
  Lenola Allen

KANSAS
Prog. Spec., Voc. Equity
  Cheryl Henderson
  Corena Mook

KENTUCKY
Director, Equal Voc. Oppor.
  Bettie Tipton
  Hazel Davis

LOUISIANA
Supervisor, Sex Equity
  Joy Joseph

OKLAHOMA
Director, Ed. Equity Services
Carolyn LeGrand
Lou Ann Hargrave
Candy Gray Sebert
Linda Wilson
Fern Green

OREGON
Specialist, Voc. Equal Education Opportunity
Hilda Thompson
Richard Schmidt
Joan Siebert Dalton

PENNSYLVANIA
Sex Equity Coordinator
Jayne Acri
Nathaniel Gadsden
Jacqueline Cullen
Florence Jean Wright

PUERTO RICO
Sex Equity Liaison
Sara Velazquez
Carmen Rivera

RHODE ISLAND
Sex Equity Consultant
Linda Greenwood

SOUTH CAROLINA
Consultant in Sex Equity
Shirley Cullen
Ann Winstead

SOUTH DAKOTA
Supervisor, Equality in Vocational Education
Judy Richards
Larry Lyngstad
Ella Stolz

TENNESSEE
Specialist, Equal Vocational Opportunity
Pearl Merritt
Andrea Pillow
Millie Huff

TEXAS
Coord. for Equal Access to Vocational Education
Christine Smart
Cecil Wright

UTAH
Equal Opportunity Specialist
Barbara Hales

VERMONT
Consultant, Vocational Sex Equity
Mary Mulloy
Henry Bissex
Noreen O'Connor
Beth Ducolon

VIRGINIA
Sex Equity Coordinator
Brenda Cloyd
Elizabeth Hawa

WASHINGTON
Voc. Sex Equity Coordinator
Harriet Gleason
Beverly Postlewaite

WEST VIRGINIA
Voc. Ed. Sex Equity Coord.
Mary Kay Harrison
Marlene Grady

WISCONSIN
Sex Equity Coord. (Postsec.)
Frances Johnson
Mary Thompson
Anna Biermeier
Voc. Equity Coord. (Sec.)
Barbara Bitters

WYOMING
Voc. Ed. Equal Opportunity Coordinator
Lois Mottonen
Julie (Marty) Uhlmann
James C. Lamprecht
Lyn Velle
Abel S. Benavides

MAINE
Affirmative Action Officer
Edward Maroon

MARYLAND
Voc. Equity Specialist
June Wilson
Marie Mayor

MASSACHUSETTS
Sex Equity Coordinator
Maureen Shannon
Judy Taylor
Elaine Cadigan

MICHIGAN
Voc. Ed. Equity Coord.
Sherry L. Anderson
Carol Wolenberg
Sara Lincoln

MINNESOTA
State Coord. for Expanded Career Choices
Jake
Shirley Walker
Donna Boben

MISSISSIPPI
Sex Equity Coordinator
Julia Sullivan
Hollistyne Mothershedd
Shirley Haggard
Judy McLarty

MISSOURI
Director, Spec. Voc. Services
Georganna Beachboard

MONTANA
Human Resource Dev. Officer
Carol Farris
Sylvia (Sib) Clack
Raymond D. Brown
Jim Whealon
Sara (Sally) Moore

NEBRASKA
State Coord., Voc. Equity Programs
Sharon Katt
Marge Hathaway

NEVADA
Directory, Elim. of Sex Bias and Sex Stereotyping
N.J. Pettit
Gary Waters
Connie Wilson
Karen McDowell
Roberta Dowell

NEW HAMPSHIRE
Consultant in Equal Access Education
Nishma Duffy

NEW JERSEY
Director, Office for Women in Equal Access-Voc. Ed.
Betty Stambolian
Jacqueline Walker

NEW MEXICO
Coord., Equal Voc. Opportunity Program
Sharon K. Fox
Muriel Grubbs
Janice Hightower

NEW YORK
Occup. Ed. Equity Coordinator
Mary Ann Etu
Carol Jabonaski

NORTH CAROLINA
Coord. for Sex Equity
Doris Jacobs (Postsec.)
Deborah Shumate (Sec.)
Marilyn Pergerson
Walter Brown
Gary Ridout

NORTH DAKOTA
Coord., Ed. Equity in Voc. Ed.
Nancy Thorndal
Carol Nelson

OHIO
Sex Equity Supervisor
Connie McSwain Blair
Carol Whitney Darling
Nancy Evans

APPENDIX C

SEX EQUITY COORDINATORS, CURRENT AND PAST, PARTICIPATING IN NATIONAL SURVEY

SHERRY L. ANDERSON, Coordinator
Vocational Education Equity
Voc-Tech Education Services
Michigan Department of Education
P.O. Box 30009
Lansing, Michigan 48909

BARBARA J. ARGUMENDO, Consultant
Community Colleges Services Unit
Higher Education and
Management Services
Michigan Department of Education
P.O. Box 30008
Lansing, Michigan 48909
GEORGANNA BEACHBOARD, Director
Special Vocational Services
State Department of Education
P.O. Box 480
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102

MR. HENRY BISSEX
269 Main Street
Montpelier, Vermont 05602

DONNA BOBEN
7 Oakridge Drive
White Bear Lake, Minnesota 55110

RAYMOND D. BROWN, Chief
Civil Rights Bureau
Personnel Division
Department of Highways
2701 Prospect Avenue
Helena, Montana 59601

CAROL CHAPIN
9 Aspen Court
Bloomfield, Connecticut 06002

CONNIE CLINE
P.O. Box 119
Brattleboro, Vermont 05301

BRENDA CLOYD, Sex Equity Coordinator
State Department of Education
P.O. Box 6Q
Richmond, Virginia 23216

HARVEY CROMETT DOE
P.O. Box F
Juneau, Alaska 99811

ELIZABETH DUCOLON, Consultant
Vocational Guidance
State Department of Education
Montpelier, Vermont 05401

EDITH EHRMANN, Supervisor
Sex Equity Program
Executive Building, Suite 520
2020 West Third Street
Little Rock, Arkansas 72202
JENNY ERWIN, Specialist
Equal Vocational Opportunities
State Department of Education
Vocational Education Division
1535 West Jefferson Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

BEVERLY GILLETTE, Consultant
Adult Education
Grimes Building
Des Moines, Iowa 50319

CONNIE GIPSON, Consultant
State Department of Education
Vocational Education
721 Capitol Mall, 4th Floor
Sacramento, California 95814

LINDA GREENWOOD, Sex Equity
Consultant
State Department of Education
Bureau of Vocational and
Adult Education
22 Hayes Street
Providence, Rhode Island 02908

JANICE GRESHAM, Supervisor
Career Orientation
Vocational Technical Education
3 Capitol Mall
Education Building West
Room 306D
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201

MURIEL GRUBBS, Coordinator
Equal Vocational Opportunity Program
Vocational Education Division
State Education Building
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87503

LOU ANN HARGRAVE, Director
Educational Equity Services
State Department of Vocational and
Technical Education
1500 West 7thAvenue
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74074

MARGE HATHAWAY
4000 South 56th Street, 119B
Lincoln, Nebraska

CHERYL HENDERSON, Program
Specialist, Vocational Equity
State Department of Education
120 East 10th Street
Topeka, Kansas 66612

DORIS JACOBS, Coordinator
for Sex Equity
Division of Vocational Education
Educational Building
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611

FRANCES JOHNSON, Sex Equity
Coordinator
Voc-Tech Adult Education Board
4802 Sheboygan Avenue
7th Floor, Box 7874
Madison, Wisconsin 53707

JOY JOSEPH, Supervisor Sex Equity
Office of Vocational Education
State Department of Education
P.O. Box 44064
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804

SHARON KATT, State Coordinator
Vocational Equity Programs
Box 94987
301 Centennial Mall South
Lincoln, Nebraska 68509-4987

JAMES C. LAMPRECHT
Laramie County Community College
1400 East College Drive
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82007-3299

ANN LARY, Specialist
Business Educational Partnership
1652 Twin Towers East
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

MARLENE GRADY LAWRENCE,
Coordinator
JTPA TRYOUT Employment
Marion County Board of Education
Department of Education
1000 Virginia Avenue
Fairmont, West Virginia 26554

SARA LINCOLN
Professional Development Unit
Michigan Department of Education
P.O. Box 30008
Lansing, Michigan 48909

LIANNE MCALLISTER
6413 York Street
Boise, Idaho 83704

MAE WILLA MASON
Department of Post Secondary
Education
4505 Executive Park Drive
Montgomery, Alabama 36116

JUDY MCLARTY, Director
Alumnae Affairs
Mississippi University of Women
P.O. Box W-10
Columbus, Mississippi 39701

PEARL MERRITT, Specialist
Equal Vocational Opportunity
State Department of Education
213 Cordell Hull Building
Nashville, Tennessee 37219

NANCY MOLLER
501 New Road
Victoria, Texas 77904

MARY MULBY, Consultant
Vocational Sex Equity
Vocational-Technical Education
State Department of Education
P.O. Box 6Q
Montpelier, Vermont 05602

NOREEN O'CONNOR
RFD 1
Marshfield, Vermont 05658

CONSTANCE READ
Elimination of Sex Bias and
Sex Stereotyping
Vocational Education
400 West King Street
Carson City, Nevada 89701

AUDREY REID, Coordinator
Vocational Equity
Office of Vocational Equity
1762 Twin Towers East
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

JUDY RICHARDS, Supervisor
Equality in Vocational Education
State Department of Education
State Office Building, No. 3
Pierre, South Dakota 57501

GARY RIDOUT, Vocational Director
P.O. Box 1336
Smithfield, North Carolina 27577

CANDY GRAY SEBERT
1814 Warren Drive
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74074

MAUREEN SHANNON, Sex Equity
Coordinator
Division of Occupational Education
State Department of Education
Quincy Center Plaza
1385 Hancock Street
Quincy, Massachusetts 02169

SHIRLEY SILVER, Vocational Education
Equity Coordinator
State Department of Education
Len B. Jordan Building
650 West State Street
Boise, Idaho 83720

CHRISTINE SMART, Coordinator for
Equal Access to Vocational
Education
Occupational Education
Texas Education Agency
201 East Eleventh Street
Austin,Texas 78701

ANN T. SMITH
Department of Post Secondary
Education
4505 Executive Park Drive
Montgomery, Alabama 36116

BETTY STAMBOLIAN, Director
Office for Women in Equal Access
Vocational Education
State Department of Education
240 West State Street
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

CINDY STERGER, Sex Equity
Coordinator
33 South Last Chance Gulch
Helena, Montana 59620-2602

NAOMI STOCKDALE, Sex Equity
Coordinator
801 West 10th Street
Pouch F - Alaska Office Building
Juneau, Alaska 99811

BARBARA TAVARES, Coordinator of
Special Services
University of Hawaii
4684 Kalanianaole Highway
Honolulu, Hawaii 96821

HILDA THOMPSON, Specialist
Vocational Equal Education
Opportunity
State Department of Education
700 Pringle Parkway, SE
Salem, Oregon 97310

NANCY THORNDAL, Coordinator
Educational Equity in Vocational
Education
North Dakota State Board for
Vocational Education
State Capitol
Bismarck, North Dakota 58501

BETTIE TIPTON, Director
Equal Vocational Opportunity
State Department of Education
Capitol Plaza Towers, Rm 2031
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

JOE TUREK, Sex Equity Supervisor
Illinois State Board of Education
DAVTE, E-426
100 North First Street
Springfield, Illinois 62777

JULIE (MARTY) UHLMANN
Department of Public Assistance
and Social Services
Hathaway Building
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002

CAROL VOTE, Sex Equity Specialist
Colorado Community College
Occupational Educaiton System
Parkway Center, Suite 600
1391 North Spear Boulevard
Denver, Colorado 80204-2554

JACQUELINE WALKER
Department of Education
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

GARY WATERS, Director
Elimination of Sex Bias and
Sex Stereotyping
Vocational Education
State Department of Education
400 King Street
Carson City, Nevada 89701

JAMES WHEALON
Office of Public Instruction
State Capitol
Helena, Montana 59601

BARBARA WHITE, Coordinator for
R & D
Vocational Education
University of Hawaii
4684 Kalanianaole Highway
Honolulu, Hawaii 96821

CAROL WHITNEY-DARLING (moved)
Sex Equity Supervisor
Division of Vocational Education
65 South Front Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215

MARY WIBERG, Sex Equity Coordinator
State Department of Education
Grimes State Office Building
Des Moines, Iowa 50319

JUNE WILSON, Vocational Equity
Specialist
Vocational Education Division
State Department of Education
200 West Baltimore Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201-2595

ANNIE S. WINSTEAD
1429 Senate Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

DIANA WOOLIS, Vocational Equity
Consultant
Division of Vocationa, Technical
and Adult Education
25 Industrial Park Road
Middletown, Connecticut 06457

CECIL Y. WRIGHT
3002 Maplelawn Circle
Austin, Texas 78723